

Comment Set E.5 through E.53: Public Hearing Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

8

1 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

2 I think that we should go now to taking
3 comments from the public. I'm going to invite some of
4 your elected officials to come speak first and make
5 their presentations. Still I would like to keep it to
6 3 minutes. I know it is hard for elected officials to
7 keep it under 3 minutes. I know it is important. We
8 want you to come up first. We know that you have an
9 important relationship with your constituents. You hear
10 a lot from them on a day-to-day basis.

11 So our first speaker, Assemblyman Curt Hagman.

12 STATEMENT OF MR. HAGMAN

13 MR. HAGMAN: Thank you. I'll try to keep it to
14 three minutes.

15 First of all, I want to say I'm very proud to
16 represent this community. I have also served as
17 councilmember, and have served as volunteer in the
18 community for many years beforehand.

19 Thank you all for coming here and hearing our
20 story. I wish you could understand this community a
21 little more to realize that the community and staff and
22 city council are basically one entity. They are one
23 voice in this matter, and have worked diligently for the
24 last 18 months to make this point can come forward.

25 So the fact that we don't have the formal
26 presentations tonight, I wish we could have part of that
27 as part of the decision making, but I'll respect that.

28 I do share the concern of the Edison power

E.5-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

9

1 route in parts of the city. Nowhere else do we have on
2 this particular project 150-foot easements where this
3 power line is going to go through the forest and that.
4 That puts more than 3,000 of our residents in partial
5 jeopardy and risk for untested type of easement route.
6 This was built a long time ago, for efficient lines with
7 different technology than it is right now.

E.5-1,
cont.

8 As you have heard, last year we had a 5.4
9 earthquake, right here in the heart of the city. We
10 have seven faults here. Convincing our residents they
11 are going to be safe going through a thousand homes
12 within 50 feet of their backyards is going to be
13 difficult for anyone to do.

E.5-2

14 I am the Vice Chair of Public Safety for the
15 assembly. This is -- public safety I believe is our
16 number one part of a government entity to keep people
17 safe. When there is viable alternative routes that are
18 possible, it is ridiculous that they want to do this.

19 The city has been working for 18 months,
20 working together, trying to pull every party involved in
21 this, Edison, state parks, the state Legislature to the
22 governor's office trying to come up with a win-win
23 solution.

24 This is not your typical constituency here.
25 We are all smart, intelligent looking at -- and they
26 have worked to support this project in concept, but they
27 highly disagree with the route that has been taken.
28 Sometimes you see that possibly -- expediency and what

E.5-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

10

1 was on paper is the cheapest, fastest, shorter route is
2 not always the better route. And that is what we are
3 here to do. These folks will articulate better tonight.

**E.5-3,
cont.**

4 Edison towers, these things will be close to
5 16 story high building next to 50 or 75 feet of
6 residents, okay? They have fallen down in unpopulated
7 areas in the past. And there is large structures, we
8 have schools and parks and residents underneath these
9 power lines. They are next door, adjacent to them, and
10 frightens residents for the safety aspect.

E.5-4

11 We need to consider, all of us, what this
12 precedent will set for the future of the state. We have
13 to rebuild infrastructure to survive these lines for our
14 current path. We need to make a smart decision, each
15 one, regionally and locally to decide and to come up
16 with best path we can.

17 I will continue to support the CARE Group, and
18 the City of Chino Hills throughout the whole process.
19 Tonight -- I see I'm out of time. You'll see how good
20 our residents are.

21 Thank you for your time.

22 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Next up I would like to call Gary
23 Neely, who is a representative of Senator Huff.

24 STATEMENT OF MR. NEELY

25 MR. NEELY: Good evening.

26 I'm sensitive to what you said about the
27 senator having better access to the Commission than the
28 citizens do. So I'm going to keep my remarks very, very

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

11

1 short, because I know for a fact that he does have
2 communications with at least one of you, if not more.

3 So, I had four pages here.

4 My name is Gary Neely. I am the District
5 Representative for Senator Huff. And he asked me to be
6 here today, because he has another event that he had
7 previously scheduled and couldn't be here, but his heart
8 is here. And believe me, his work on this issue -- I
9 know that he has been having meetings up in Sacramento
10 with some of you and Edison and some of the other
11 council from Chino Hills to come up. He has been
12 working very hard on that. The fact that he is not here
13 doesn't mean he isn't here.

14 The fact that I'm here doesn't mean that we
15 would like to see you not do this project. We do in
16 fact support Edison's plan to deliver 20 percent
17 renewable energy through this project. The problem that
18 we have is simply the segment of the project that goes
19 through the residential area in Chino Hills.

20 I am going to make it real short. The most
21 serious problem is the safety issue. I'm not going to
22 itemize them all, because you are going to be here a
23 long time. You've got an awful lot of good friends
24 going to talk to you.

25 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Oh, yeah.

26 MR. HUFF: I do want to mention the 150-foot
27 easement. We did some studies, our office did some
28 studies. What we found in conjunction with Edison is

E.6-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

12

1 there isn't any place else in the country where there is
2 an easement of 125 feet that has this size poles and
3 this amount of power going through the poles. Anyway,
4 it is dangerous. I'm not going to get into the EMF
5 question. I think that we all understand that that has
6 not been decided yet. There is a reason it has not been
7 decided yet.

**E.6-1,
cont.**

8 There is a concern whether or not these things
9 fall. I know that they will. If they happen to fall,
10 and I'll tell you if you have been out here, we have
11 some serious winds, serious winds. And if one of them
12 fall, we are going to lose some people.

E.6-2

E.6-3

13 So, please, I'm going to end my comments with
14 that. And I want to thank you for taking the time to
15 come out in this beautiful city. I'm here on a regular
16 basis. And you are right, this is a nice facility.

17 We encourage you to support the City of Chino
18 Hills alternative that has been proposed. Thanks.

19 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

20 By the way, I would like to thank the City of
21 Chino Hills for hosting tonight's public participation
22 hearing, for working so closely with us, with our staff
23 to try to make sure that this came about smoothly. And
24 we have the best experience so we could get you here to
25 be able to participate, and so we can hear you.

26 So next I'm going to call up Mayor Pro Tem
27 Bill Kruger.

28 STATEMENT OF MR. KRUGER

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

13

1 MR. KRUGER: Good evening. Welcome to the city of
2 Chino Hills.

3 Our modest city is a family-oriented community
4 with many multigenerational families. We have a very
5 highly educated workforce that forms the economic engine
6 within the Inland Empire. For our size, we are 13th
7 safest city in the United States and enjoy one of the
8 areas lowest crime rates.

9 As a community, we recognize and support the
10 need for all forms of green energy. We are not against
11 the Tehachapi Project. However, we feel there is a
12 better, safer and more cost-effective route without
13 additional cost to the project, will bring additional
14 benefits within our city and the public who visit our
15 state park.

E.7-1

16 When we realized the impacts that would occur
17 from the proposed route through our city, we didn't
18 contemplate saying no to the project. Instead, our city
19 has tried to improve the route and add additional
20 benefits to the environment in the process.

21 Over the last 18 months the City of Chino
22 Hills has invested significant moneys to evaluate,
23 design, and compare alternative routes that would
24 support the goals of the project while minimizing the
25 impacts to residents.

26 In an effort to obtain a win-win situation, we
27 have held meetings with the state park, Edison and
28 environmental groups to mitigate any issues that each

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

14

1 organization might have. Our city has invested heavily
2 in this process with little support from the Edison
3 company. In fact, the City of Chino Hills did the work
4 that Edison should have done.

5 (Applause)

6 MR. KRUGER: Residents will speak on many valid
7 concerns about the planned route, the lack of interest
8 of Edison to work with our city, the determination of
9 our residents, the positives that can be obtained with
10 the route change and finally the lawsuit that was filed
11 concerning the overburdening of the easement.

12 Some of the concerns you will hear about, and
13 you've heard some already, the 200-foot towers within
14 the area less than 100 feet from homes, that no other
15 narrow easement was used along a 500-kilovolt lines in
16 densely populated areas. In fact, in the entire TRTP
17 the route the only place where 150-foot easement is is
18 proposed in Chino Hills.

19 The line crosses multiple earthquake faults,
20 potential taking of homes and properties especially in
21 the existing economic environment is just unrealistic.
22 The devaluation of homes and properties, the further
23 degradation of viewshed, concerns of electric and
24 magnetic fields.

25 But there are some positives, and I won't go
26 into those because I'm almost out of time. You will
27 hear about them from our residents.

28 In summary, our city has worked very

**E.7-1,
cont.**

E.7-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

15

1 diligently to provide better solutions to all parties
2 concerned while beating the goal of transferring
3 significant re-energy to Southern California. In the
4 event this effort is not sufficient, the City of Chino
5 Hill will pursue with all vigor that existing lawsuit we
6 have filed.

7 Thank you.

8 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Actually, I see on the signup
9 sheet on our list, is the Chino Hills City Attorney. So
10 if you would like to, I can't quite make out your name.

11 Can you introduce yourself.

12 STATEMENT OF MR. HENSLEY

13 MR. HENSLEY: My name is Mark Hensley. I'm the
14 City Attorney for Chino Hills. That is H-e-n-s-l-e-y.

15 I wanted to talk about two points. But after
16 listening to the gentleman from Aspen Environmental, I
17 want to touch upon one more.

18 Right after it was stated that no
19 determination has been made with regard to the project.
20 Aspen Environmental came forward and said that there
21 would be no condemnation required in this area for this
22 project. Well, the first thing that comes to mind is
23 how can Aspen make that statement if no determination
24 has been made?

25 (Applause)

26 MR. HENSLEY: That right-of-way is insufficient
27 for the height of these towers, significant evidence
28 will be presented. There is not one study, not even a

E.8-1

E.8-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

16

1 piece of paper that Edison has that shows that that
2 right-of-way is sufficient. So for Aspen to come
3 forward at this hearing and tell this -- the members of
4 this public that none of their property will be taken,
5 it is really just inappropriate.

6 There is other points I want to make, and one
7 of them was already stated, is that the City has filed a
8 lawsuit against Edison. We have the easement agreement,
9 and our position is that these towers are too large for
10 this right-of-way.

11 There is a law known as overburdening an
12 easement. At some point the use is just too big, and
13 our position is that this use is too big. We expect it
14 is going to take between two and five years to resolve
15 this matter.

16 I raise that know not because we want to be
17 obstructionists, but because we were told that time is
18 is an issue in this project. Edison has made that very
19 clear. We don't want to slow this down. In fact, we
20 spent a million dollars coming up with at least four if
21 not five alternatives, all of which Edison has really
22 turned a deaf ear to.

23 Finally, I want to talk about the Aerojet
24 property. I'm certain that all of you have been told
25 that the Aerojet property is a big stumbling block using
26 the City Alternative C. This is either intentional
27 misinformation, or perhaps worse, negligent
28 misinformation being distributed by Edison.

**E.8-2,
cont.**

E.8-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

17

1 We have a letter from the Department of Toxic
2 Substance Control, the entity that is responsible for
3 overseeing the cleanup of this property, that clearly
4 says that the portion of the right-of-way that is
5 necessary for Alternative C is clean. And, in fact, in
6 meeting with the PUC staff, Edison representatives,
7 Aspen Environmental with regard to the remaining issue
8 of access to the route, we were told by Aspen
9 Environmental, while they had not spent any time really
10 mapping out the access routes to get to the
11 right-of-way, that in fact they did not see any problem
12 with getting access to the right-of-way.

13 So why then does the Draft EIR say that there
14 is a problem with that property, the Aerojet property?
15 And why wasn't it analyzed in more depth and seriously?

16 Thank you.

17 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: I do want to add one thing. With
18 regard to anything that was said in the Draft
19 Environmental Impact Report that was issued last month,
20 if you have comments, if you have evidence, you have
21 other things that you want to present in writing to
22 Aspen or to us, there is information both -- on our
23 website. We have information about how -- from the
24 folks are been across from us. I'm sure that anybody
25 here who is representing the Commission can find a way
26 to get that information to our environmental consultants
27 and to our staff so that that will be evaluated as part
28 of the environmental review.

E.8-3,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

18

1 We are not trying to ignore any of the
2 evidence, and we take very seriously your health and
3 well being, honestly and truly.

4 So I want -- not just the City itself, but if
5 any of you individually have comments that you want to
6 give to that, to the consultants, to our staff, it will
7 be considered and will be responded to individually in
8 our Final Environmental Impact Report, Environment
9 Impact Statement.

10 I have people who are lined up as being
11 government representatives who are not from the City of
12 Chino Hills. I want to invite some of them up as well.
13 I have someone here named Scott Murphy from the City of
14 Ontario.

15 STATEMENT OF MR. MURPHY

16 MR. MURPHY: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.

17 My name is Scott Murphy, M-u-r-p-h-y,
18 Assistant Planning Director.

19 We are very supportive of the need for
20 renewable sources of energy. We are very supportive of
21 this project. The real question comes down to whether
22 it is the appropriate alignment.

23 The segments that run through the City of
24 Ontario, most people look at it and say why do you
25 really care, there are more houses than people? Over
26 the next 20 to 30 years there will be in excess of
27 120,000 new residents that will be in this area.

28 It is through the eyes of those future

E.9-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

19

1 residents that we look at the EIR/EIS and determined
2 what is the appropriate alignment, what would provide
3 least amount of impact to the City of Ontario. The
4 Alternative 2 that was proposed by Southern California
5 Edison would result in new transmission facilities to be
6 provided. It will also result in the removal and
7 replacement of existing facilities with even larger
8 facilities. Clearly, this would have a very significant
9 negative impact on the aesthetics of the area.

10 Considering Alternative 4, whether it be versions A, B
11 and C or D, from the City's standpoint, this has no
12 impact above and beyond what is currently existing in
13 the community.

14 We would support Alternative 4 as the
15 preferred alignment for the City of Ontario.

16 Thank you.

17 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: I have a Brent Arnold from the
18 City of Chino.

19 STATEMENT OF MR. ARNOLD

20 MR. ARNOLD: Good evening, Ms. Kolakowski and
21 members of the Commission.

22 I'm Brent Arnold, City of Chino. We are the
23 city on the other side of the freeway with no hills.

24 (Laughter)

25 MR. ARNOLD: But we do have similarities with the
26 City of Chino Hills. Many of the impacts that have been
27 spoken here tonight, we have similar impacts in the City
28 of Chino.

E.9-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

20

1 We intend to submit a response letter on
2 April 6th in regard to the EIS/EIR. We believe the
3 analysis, especially regarding our neighborhoods near
4 Yellowstone Circle and our Easton residents have been
5 inadequately conducted especially with regard to noise,
6 safety, EMFs hazards, land use. What is going to happen
7 to property rights of businesses and residents who have
8 easements over their land where they use in business or
9 enjoyment when the larger voltage lines come through?
10 Is that going to change? That is not discussed in the
11 EIR. That is a huge issue for the City of Chino,
12 because we like our property rights.

E.10-1

13 In addition, I think when we evaluated the
14 EIR, we felt, like in many areas, the EIR didn't go far
15 enough. For instance, the noise, they modeled the noise
16 in Chino Hills from the Circle area and other
17 residential areas, but they didn't add the existing
18 transmission line in the model. So we don't have any
19 conclusive information that the ambiance is being
20 affected. So from a technical standpoint, we have an
21 issue with that.

E.10-2

22 I don't want to get anymore technicalities.
23 We will submit our comments on April 6th.

24 But I will say in terms of the overall
25 impacts, the project's potential impacts, the project
26 potentially impacts more residences in Chino Hills. In
27 Chino Hills they are similar impacts to the residents in
28 Chino.

E.10-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

21

1 What we believe is that the Alternative 4 and
2 those alternatives significantly reduce the impacts to
3 the City of Chino. And we would welcome your evaluation
4 of that and ultimate decision.

5 That concludes my comments.

6 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

7 Next we will have Stan Carroll who is the
8 Major of La Habra Heights.

9 STATEMENT OF MR. CARROLL

10 MR. CARROLL: Thank you very much, Commissioner
11 and the representatives.

12 It is Stan Carroll, C-a-r-r-o-l-l, Major of
13 the City of La Habra Heights.

14 I must say this chamber is beautiful. I'm not
15 making any comparisons.

16 Our town was created about 30 years ago. It
17 is a rural environment about eight miles west of here, a
18 population of about 6,000 people, 1 acre minimum, where
19 we emphasize natural beautiful and the rural character.

20 We object, disagree and disapprove of this
21 Draft EIR on a number of grounds. It impacts and
22 violates our general plan that we developed several
23 years ago through large community involvement. And more
24 specifically some of the elements that it violates is
25 scenic views.

26 What we see from the planned draft is towers
27 that go from 70 feet, you've heard this before, to
28 200 feet, you know it well. We see the number of towers

E.10-3,
cont.

E.11-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

22

1 where there are two to be able to expand to three, where
2 there is one there will now be two, and one place where
3 there are two where there will now be four.

**E.11-1,
cont.**

4 There is also new a route that will come
5 straight through the corner of our community, and we
6 object to that.

E.11-2

7 We see this violating, once again, this rural
8 character of the community. It violates our noise
9 element and our safety element.

E.11-3

10 We will be submitting in writing prior to
11 April 6th our objections, and we ask that they be
12 addressed through mitigation.

13 I kept it under three minutes. Thank you very
14 much.

15 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Next, Brian Bergman,
16 Councilmember from La Habra Heights.

17 STATEMENT OF MR. BERGMAN

18 MR. BERGMAN: Thank you.

19 I'm going to try to go over a few things, and
20 hopefully won't repeat what Mayor Carroll was talking
21 about.

22 But like he said, the proposed project as
23 identified in the Draft EIR is inconsistent with the
24 general plan goals of La Habra Heights.

E.12-1

25 Goal number one in our city is to protect,
26 preserve and enhance the residential rural character and
27 individual environmental lifestyle of La Habra Heights.

28 He talked about preserving scenic views.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

23

1 Goal number five, protect, preserve and
2 encourage open space within the city to ensure the
3 maintenance of wildlife habitats, wildlife corridors,
4 natural drainage courses and recreational resources.

E.12-1,
cont.

5 And goal number six is encourage expansion and
6 use of the existing trail system for horseback riding,
7 bicycling and hiking.

8 The way this is proposed in the Draft EIR, it
9 cuts right through Potter Canyon. That is our major
10 recreational area for the whole entire area that is La
11 Habra Heights. There is a series of trails that go
12 through there. People ride bicycles, horseback riding
13 et cetera. And the proposed, much higher lattice towers
14 will create visual impacts and increase noise, which is
15 totally inconsistent with the community values of La
16 Habra Heights and violates our general plan.

E.12-2

17 Thank you.

18 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Next will be Paul Benson from
19 Chino Valley Fire.

20 STATEMENT OF MR. BENSON

21 MR. BENSON: Good evening.

22 Paul Benson, B-e-n-s-o-n. I'm the Fire Chief
23 of the Chino Valley Fire District.

24 Although I'm a resident, I'm speaking to the
25 advisors and the Commissioner this evening on this
26 subject as the Fire Chief of the Fire District. And I
27 would like to note that my comments are specific to
28 those portions and elements of the Draft EIR that deal

E.13-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

24

1 with fire prevention and suppression, specifically those
2 along Segment 8 of the proposed corridor.

3 The Fire District has been a partner with the
4 21st Century Green Partnership with the City and other
5 members. While we certainly do support the overall
6 project in the attempt to bring renewable energy
7 resources into the valley here and to support that
8 project, we are very concerned with the language and the
9 things that have been addressed thus far in the Draft
10 EIR.

11 I will generally speak to just a few of those.
12 We will follow-up with written comments specific to
13 those items at the Commission next week.

14 First of all, I would like to suggest that as
15 a fire suppression and prevention element of the Draft
16 EIR, we think the focus should be first on life safety
17 and then property safety. I think that is -- as a fire
18 professional that is our duty and due diligence in this
19 whole process.

20 Very little, if any, emphasis has been placed
21 on life safety, and the Draft EIR seems to be more
22 focused on the dissembled fire aspect and impacts to the
23 environment from fire. Specifically, there have been no
24 prioritization of values at risk in the Draft EIR as it
25 is written.

26 SCE's alternate, Alternative No. 2, places
27 lines perilously close to structures with
28 insufficient -- existing, insufficient clearances from

**E.13-1,
cont.**

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

25

1 those structures. And they already run through -- the
2 existing lines already run through watershed that is of
3 high fire danger and is also known to have had numerous
4 fires, large energy fires in the existing right-of-way
5 in the past. Now they want to bring an additional
6 100 feet to those, and the clearances are insufficient
7 as they are now.

8 The Draft EIR in this particular area is also
9 misleading, and I believe inaccurate and to some degree
10 biased to SCE's proposal. I don't believe due diligence
11 was done in evaluating the alternatives, other than
12 potentially SCE's. It fails to consider, as an example,
13 in Alternative 4 from the City of Chino Hills, the
14 removal of existing power lines that are existing in the
15 FARC, their proposal. However, it does address the
16 removal of existing power lines in SCE's proposed.

17 It incorrectly assesses the impacts to aerial
18 firefighting by those towers. Certainly there is an
19 impact from the aerial towers and aerial firefighting
20 operation. However, it places different values on those
21 proposals you want to review.

22 It also doesn't specifically address the
23 insufficient separation that is currently in the
24 existing corridor. And as I mentioned, nor is there any
25 attempt to place values at risk and quantify those in
26 the process. This overall lack of due diligence in
27 evaluating those proposals from fire prevention and
28 suppression standpoint is concerning.

E.13-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

26

1 We will certainly be providing written
2 comments back to, as I mentioned, back to the
3 Commission. And I would also appreciate the opportunity
4 in that process to address a number of other issues, but
5 I'll keep my comments tonight specific to fire
6 prevention suspension.

7 Thank you.

8 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

9 STATEMENT OF MR. GRAHAM

10 MR. GRAHAM: Thank you.

11 My name is Ed Graham. I have been a City
12 Councilmember in Chino Hills since 1991.

13 You know, first off, I would like to welcome
14 and acknowledge for you people sitting up here, because
15 you can't see them, the hundreds of residents that have
16 shown up tonight. They are in the lobby, the overflow,
17 the lobby.

18 (Applause)

19 MR. GRAHAM: I want to echo something that has
20 been said. This is a wonderful community.

21 And we have tried working with Edison, we've
22 tried working with the state parks, we tried working
23 with you folks. You want a win-win situation to happen
24 out of all of this.

25 This is a family-oriented community, and our
26 residents have really stood up on this particular
27 project.

28 I do have two pages of prepared notes, but I'm

**E.13-1,
cont.**

E.14-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

27

1 not going to read them, because it is technical
2 information you folks already know.

3 Government was never --

4 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: If you would like, you can have
5 them entered into the record, into the transcript. Give
6 them to the reporter.

7 MR. GRAHAM: Government was never intended to do
8 this type of project, was it? You know, we spent a
9 million dollars, and all we want is to move the lines
10 three miles to the south. That is it. We are not
11 trying to stop it, we just want it moved.

12 I got back from Washington, D.C., this week
13 representing our community in Washington. And as you
14 travel around Washington, you see that phrase, "We the
15 People, For the People." You see that everywhere. But
16 this project at this location does not fit that
17 statement.

18 Thank you.

19 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Next, Ron Krueper from the
20 California State Parks.

21 STATEMENT OF MR. KRUEPER

22 MR. KRUEPER: Good evening.

23 Ron Krueper, K-r-u-e-p-e-r.

24 I'm speaking to you tonight for Department of
25 Parks Recreation. In addition to my overview tonight, I
26 will also include these comments with the additional
27 letter in response to DEIR for April 6th.

28 State parks is the trustee and responsible

E.14-2

E.15-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

28

1 agency defined under CEQA. As the office responsible
2 for the stewardship of Chino Hills State Park and the
3 California Poppy Reserve, which is another area that we
4 oversee, the long-term health of these two parks are
5 dependent on the regional ecosystems because the biotic
6 boundaries of the park extend beyond the jurisdictional
7 boundaries.

8 State parks fully supports renewable efforts
9 in addressing climate changes. The environment -- as
10 we've reviewed the DEIR/EIS, and whatnot, the Chino
11 Hills Alternative A through D routes on the traverse --
12 the proposal for Chino Hills State Park is in conflict
13 with the Chino Hills General Plan. And any amendment or
14 change to that plan would have to be looked at through
15 our California State Park Recreation Commission, which
16 also is the responsible agency under this alternative
17 before it is to be pursued.

18 The plan and the plan amendment submitted to
19 them would have to be approved. Approvals of amendments
20 for the general plan would be discretionary on the part
21 of the Commission. Commission action is also part of
22 the public process that includes public hearings in a
23 manner that would not occur until after the actions
24 taken by the Public Utilities Commission.

25 These combined actions required of the
26 department would add a significant amount of time to the
27 proposed project and elimination, and a significant
28 amount of time to allow to go through that process.

**E.15-1,
cont.**

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

29

1 Management of the Chino Hills State Park, of
2 course, as I said, is the government's general plan.
3 Placement of new and expanded transmission lines, the
4 switching stations in Chino would conflict with the
5 state park-wide goals and guidelines in managing
6 park-wide natural resources, interpretation, visitor
7 uses and enjoyment.

8 Any such lines would also be consistent with
9 the primary goals of the Core Habitat Zone and the
10 Natural and State Zone.

11 The primary goal of the Core Habitat Zone is
12 to preserve and protect the sensitive plant and animal
13 species. They support habitats as well as protect the
14 movement of plants and animals within the park and
15 throughout the region. The research and protection
16 would be foremost consideration for all land use in
17 management decisions.

18 We concur with the DEIR conclusion that the
19 implementation of Chino Hills Alternative 4 is not
20 consistent with the Chino Hills General Plan and would
21 be considered significant and an unavoidable impact.

22 At this time I want to take the time to talk
23 about the spirit to date and the resource protection,
24 what Chino Hills State Park really stands for.

25 The creation of Chino Hills State Park as it
26 exists today has occurred due to tremendous amount of
27 public funding, bonds, grants, donations that is
28 estimated in the hundreds of million dollars. In

E.15-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

30

1 addition, there are several million more spent on
2 wildlife, plant habitat, restoration improvement
3 projects.

4 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Sir, could you wrap it up? If
5 you have written comments, you can provide them, have
6 them added to the transcript.

7 MR. KRUEPER: Okay, thank you.

8 This park has significant amount of investment
9 that has been made over time. And this additional
10 infrastructure, as I've talked about, would only devalue
11 that investment into the park.

12 Visitors, I just want to say that visitors
13 often comment when they come to Chino Hill State Park:
14 Are we really still in Southern California? This
15 comment could probably be attributed to the effect in
16 past management and planning practices and acquisition
17 of park property to include sensitive gridline and
18 watershed to ensure the feeling it is kept for future
19 generations.

20 At this point in time the Alternative 4 would
21 still have significant impacts that State Parks
22 Management cannot hold at this time.

23 Thank you.

24 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

25 Next we are going to be moving onto all of
26 these other public speakers who signed up.

27 Now, we have about three dozen people who
28 signed up to speak. And in order for us to move through

**E.15-1,
cont.**

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

31

1 this quickly, it would really help if -- I'm going to
2 read out several names, if you get in line so that you
3 would move one to the other.

4 One thing I've discovered is the folks here in
5 Chino Hills are passionate people, especially about this
6 particular issue. However, if you could restrain your
7 applause, certainly your boos, so that we can move
8 quickly from one speaker to the next.

9 If everybody before you or somebody else
10 before you has said something that -- I think I'm seeing
11 more names coming, we have more -- that if you are just
12 going to say that you agree with what a whole bunch of
13 other people said before, you can come up and say I
14 agree with all these other people. You don't have to
15 take three minutes in order to do that.

16 So I'm going to start with -- I'm going to
17 read out three names Debra Hernandez, Jim Case and
18 Janette Short.

19 STATEMENT OF MS. HERNANDEZ

20 MS. HERNANDEZ: Good evening, your Honor,
21 Commissioner.

22 My name is Debra Hernandez, member of CARE.

23 CARE is an organization of concerned citizens
24 here in the Chino Valley, citizens that value
25 electricity. We have been researching this project
26 since it was first brought to our attention back in,
27 ironically, March of 2007 at the first open house
28 meeting in Diamond Bar. At the time we brought it to

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

32

1 the city council, because we knew from the very start
2 what the impacts and some of the issues of this were
3 going to be.

4 We are going to have a number of people speak
5 this evening. But to mitigate having overage, we've
6 each gotten different items to address. But we feel
7 there are a number of pieces of erroneous information
8 that actually led in the DEIR to the selection of the
9 Edison plan.

10 The impact of the 200-foot tall towers along
11 with residences and right-of-ways that were originally
12 initiated in the '40s, and lines have been enacted in
13 1972, really doesn't hold any water today. There
14 weren't any towers in the '40s.

15 It does scare people to have something that
16 close to such a small right-of-way. If anything
17 happens, those are our homes, those are our children.
18 It is a serious and really real consequence that people
19 have to take into consideration.

20 We are faced with the impact. Again, as I
21 said, we are faced with the impact of this. We went to
22 our city council. They didn't make a major reaction to
23 it. They didn't say not in our backyard. We all said
24 from the very start we want this renewable energy. We
25 all know it is the direction we need to go. However, we
26 have an opportunity to do it right the first time. This
27 is something new. We don't have to make mistakes this
28 time. So we are asking you to please listen to what we

E.16-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

33

1 are saying, do it right.

2 We have worked with the Department of Toxic
3 Substances, Aerojet, the parks, SCE, with the
4 Commission. We have come up with alternatives. We have
5 spent a great deal of time and money, more than any
6 other city I think has ever done to help mitigate an
7 issue like this.

E.16-2

8 Please hear what we are saying. Please, if
9 this was your city, is this the plan that you would
10 select?

11 Thank you.

12 STATEMENT OF MR. CASE

13 MR. CASE: My name is Jim Case, C-a-s-e.

14 I'm one of the 1,000 homeowners and 3,000
15 people that will be impacted in the City of Chino Hills
16 if the Southern California Edison plan goes forward.

17 I decided to speak tonight because when I was
18 up late last night looking at the report, the draft
19 report, on the website, I realized that there was a
20 statement on page 135 that was -- absolutely made me
21 incredulous. It says under Land Use in the summary
22 check table under the Southern California proposed
23 project Alternative 2 that no residential land uses
24 would be temporarily or permanently displaced by the
25 project.

E.17-1

26 I can tell you that that is just not true.
27 And I feel like the 3,000 residents in the city of Chino
28 Hills and probably others in some of the neighboring

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

34

1 communities are all conceivably part of a grand
2 experiment if the Southern California Edison project
3 goes through.

4 I understand there is no other residential
5 community in the country with these kinds of power lines
6 in such a narrow easement. And I applaud our city
7 leaders and our hundreds of CARE volunteers who have
8 taken it on directly, in an aggressive fashion. Because
9 like the rest of us in the city of Chino Hills, they
10 really do care.

11 I really urge the Commission to follow one of
12 the alternatives that has been carefully researched and
13 supported by the citizens and leadership of the city,
14 and move forward with a recommendation that we move in a
15 very different direction than the Southern California
16 Edison proposal.

17 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Jeanette Short, Stephen Blagden
18 and Barry Fischer.

19 STATEMENT OF MS. SHORT

20 MS. SHORT: Good evening.

21 My name is Jeanette Short, and I've lived in
22 Chino Hills for 17 years. I'm a working mother of four
23 children, and am a member of the CARE Group and have
24 worked on this project for almost two years. I'm going
25 to speak quickly, because I only have three minutes.

26 Our city developed a more viable alternate
27 route which the CARE Group endorsed, Alternate Route C.
28 The CPUC should reward communities that come up with

**E.17-1,
cont.**

E.18-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

35

1 creative solutions to difficult problems, not then
2 ignore them and refuse to study the mitigation impacts.

3 The CPUC should use the City of Chino Hills as
4 an example setting precedent for other communities
5 regarding current ongoing and future projects.

6 As proposed by the City, the Alternate Route C
7 implements mitigation plans and designates a portion of
8 money for various mitigation elements, that makes sense
9 from the state park's review, and consider making its
10 own recommendations on how to spend the money in light
11 of the recent park fires. Flexibility is important on
12 this point.

E.18-1,
cont.

13 The value of mitigation plan is also enhanced
14 by our state budget crisis. There is absolutely no
15 chance for an appropriation from the state to the park
16 in this budget environment. This is once in a lifetime
17 chance to help the park and the community at the same
18 time.

E.18-2

19 I don't understand why the parks would not
20 amend their general plan to use this huge opportunity to
21 their benefit. I believe the mitigation plan is
22 consistent with the park's plans and goals by enhancing
23 it, not destroying it like it would if the lines were
24 put in our neighborhoods.

25 The park was completely burned last fall. The
26 danger fire -- the fire danger, which the Draft EIR
27 attributes it to Alternate C, is a moot point. The fire
28 danger in the park is at an all-time low. The risk of

E.18-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

36

1 increased fire to the construction of the lines is
2 absolutely minimum, if any. And the Draft EIR has to be
3 rewritten to take into account the effect of the recent
4 fire.

**E.18-3,
cont.**

5 I don't understand the thinking behind how
6 more important the fire danger is in the park versus the
7 same fire danger in a residential neighborhood. No one
8 lost their homes.

9 (Applause)

10 MS. SHORT: Alternate Route C will have fewer
11 impact on noise traffic, air quality management,
12 environmental contamination, socioeconomics and
13 electrical interference of electrical towers that
14 Southern California Edison's route has. The Draft EIR
15 dismisses these as less valuable, because they are
16 related to temporary construction impacts. This is
17 absolutely not true. The land use economics and
18 electrical hazards are permanent impacts on our
19 community, not to mention the air quality.

E.18-4

20 My son and I have chronic asthma. During
21 construction, the air quality exceeds the daily emission
22 threshold. The air will be filled with PM10 and PM2.5
23 during construction and ongoing maintenance of the
24 easement. PM10 is particulate matter the width of a
25 strand of hair, and PM2.5 is particulate that you cannot
26 see. SCE can use mitigating efforts to control future
27 dust that you can see, but not the dust you can't. This
28 is extremely dangerous, because we all breathe in this

E.18-5

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

37

1 bad air, and it gets into our lungs.

2 This is detrimental to sensitive receptors
3 like me and my son, because they cause asthma attacks.
4 And as a mother to sit and listen to your son gasp for
5 air is something that I continue to do. (Inaudible),
6 ongoing medications, staying up all night to make sure
7 he is still breathing and emergency hospital visits is
8 something you the CPUC will force upon us if you choose
9 SCE's route.

E.18-5,
cont.

10 Other sensitive receptors in our community
11 include our senior residents and those that already have
12 diminished health problems, including those with cancer.

E.18-6

13 The noise impact also will be permanent. It
14 will affect everyone along SCE's route, and be
15 especially damaging to those who wear hearing aids.

E.18-7

16 Alternate C is the superior and preferred
17 alternate. SCE should have figured out an alternate
18 like this when they first designed the project. And
19 they know it, even if they won't admit it. Money
20 shouldn't be an issue, doing the right thing is.

E.18-8

21 If Alternate Route C does not get chosen, then
22 I beg of you to go back to the drawing board and find
23 another route. Because the environmental impacts on
24 human species, the citizens of Chino Hills who were not
25 in the Draft EIR matter. We matter. We care.

26 Thank you.

27 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: When you interrupt people with
28 applause and things, it is going to slow down the

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

38

1 ability for everybody else to be heard. I know you are
2 enthusiastic, but we really want to hear what everybody
3 has to say.

4 I have Stephen Blagden, Barry Fischer, Dave
5 Cowardin.

6 STATEMENT OF MR. BLAGDEN

7 MR. BLAGDEN: Stephen Blagden, B-l-a-g-d-e-n, La
8 Habra Heights.

9 Thanks for coming to hear us.

10 I've been to several scoping meetings and
11 submitted comments and issues to address. There still
12 are outstanding alternatives and mitigations not
13 addressed. For example, there is mitigation for Rose
14 Hills Cemetery, but none for the living in La Habra
15 Heights.

16 Mitigation such as using tubular poles, larger
17 conductors to reduce noise, Polymer Insulators, et
18 cetera, are mentioned generally but not where they would
19 be used. Noise and mitigation is weakly covered in the
20 Draft EIR, in comments.

21 Better consideration of rerouting the San
22 Gabriels through the Cajon Pass. The second alternative
23 is to use and expand the existing right-of-way, not the
24 60 freeway through Industry dropping right down to
25 Chino. This is an existing industrial area that would
26 bypass La Habra Heights, Chino Hills and the Chino Hills
27 State Park.

28 Edison twice promised visual simulations to

E.19-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

39

1 our City of La Habra Heights, so (inaudible) could be
2 made, but none received yet.

3 The 500 kV and the existing 220s would be put
4 on one tower, combining them into one and reducing
5 aesthetic issues and also reducing the space needed.

6 I would use the tubular poles instead of the
7 lattice ones and retrofit the existing 220s onto tubular
8 poles. If they use larger conductors they will reduce
9 noise and retrofit the 220s also. They should use
10 Polymer Insulators to reduce noise and also retrofit the
11 220s with the same measure.

12 There was no EMF study in the Draft EIR for
13 the effects of the Skyline Trails under the lines. The
14 trails were there before the lines were built, and this
15 wasn't even covered. This needs to be addressed.

16 The revisions to the Draft EIR needs to be
17 made discussing alternative routes not considered or
18 weakly considered and where the mitigation will be made.

19 Thank you.

20 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Barry Fischer, David Cowardin and
21 Jeanne Prindiville.

22 STATEMENT OF MR. FISCHER

23 MR. FISCHER: Barry Fischer, F-i-s-c-h-e-r, Chino
24 Hills.

25 We should not be here. This hearing should
26 not be happening. This should have been resolved months
27 ago.

28 The need for renewable energy is not the

E.19-1,
cont.

E.19-2

E.19-3

E.20-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

40

1 issue. The erroneous planning, route planning for this
2 agenda, for this hearing should have been addressed
3 months ago.

4 Actually, at the inception of the route
5 planning selection, the very first Edison supervisor who
6 looked at the very first draft route proposal should
7 have fell on his hands and insisted, demanded this
8 particular section of the route through the city of
9 Chino Hills be rethought.

10 When erroneous thinking happens for the first
11 time, you have to learn from it. The bisecting by the
12 10 freeway was wrong. It is imperative lessons be
13 learned. You don't bisect a city, residential areas,
14 especially with possible hazards, ramifications and
15 unknown dangers involved, actual physical dangers to the
16 people and structures.

17 Even in wartime efforts are made,
18 considerations are made by civilized participants to
19 limit the danger, damage and destruction to residential
20 areas and cities. The fact that this route is still
21 being considered is embarrassing, insulting and
22 ridiculous.

23 This Edison proposed route through the center
24 of the city of Chino Hills is unconscionable,
25 inconceivable, pathetic, narrow-minded, thoughtless,
26 tragic and just wrong. Sometimes it actually is, and it
27 just does come down to simply being right or wrong,
28 knowing right from wrong. You see a hungry child and

**E.20-1,
cont.**

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

41

1 you feed the child, that is right. The corporate
2 bailouts are right, the AIG bonuses are wrong. The
3 proposed Edison route through the City of Chino Hills,
4 this is wrong.

5 We must learn from the past. Pickett's Charge
6 at Gettysburg was bad military tactics. The Austrian
7 charge ordered by the British officers in the Carpathian
8 Mountains was tragic. Shame on the officers. Pomona
9 was bisected by the 10 freeway, shame on the freeway
10 planners. If Chino Hills is allowed to be bisected by
11 this Edison proposal, shame on you. Don't buy into what
12 can only be considered plain stubborn thinking.

13 The Chino Hills draft should have been stopped
14 at every review, but it wasn't. Thank God this process
15 now includes you and this hearing. You are a public
16 Commission. It is in your name and obligation to watch
17 out for the public.

18 I too am a Commissioner, a Public Works
19 Commissioner for the City of Chino Hills. On occasion I
20 have voted against prevailing proposals.

21 You are the court of last resort. You have
22 the power, right and obligation to stop this insanity.
23 The bisecting of Chino Hills must be prevented. Utilize
24 the outskirts to circumvent, not bisect. Don't repeat
25 Pomona. The first battle in California's fight for
26 independence was the battle of Chino. This is too a
27 good fight that we are fighting here now.

28 I beg of you to route these towers around the

E.20-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

42

1 city of Chino Hills. Remember, you cannot spell
2 electricity without city.

**E.20-1,
cont.**

3 STATEMENT OF MR. COWARDIN

4 MR. COWARDIN: Good evening.

5 My name is Dave Cowardin, and I reside in the
6 city of Whittier. I'm chairman for the Technical
7 Advisory Committee for the Queen Hills Landfill Native
8 Habitat Protection Authority.

9 I'm not here representing either body.
10 However, our interest is rather unique in the westerly
11 end of the system, Segment 8, and that has to do with --
12 we have no alternatives. We own existing right-of-way
13 that runs right down the guts of our preserve, which is
14 about 4,000 acres, about a quarter of the size of Chino
15 Hills State Park. But it is part of the critical
16 habitat corridor that runs along Puente Hills connecting
17 the San Gabriels and Cleveland National Park.

18 As it is now, we have existing towers there,
19 and we are expected to absorb double the size of the
20 towers and double the width of the right-of-way. This
21 is not right, considering that the Habitat Authority --
22 and I provided information at the scoping meeting having
23 to do with the choice of alternative routes.

E.21-1

24 What you have here is an EIR which is supposed
25 to be full information document that provides the
26 decision makers with different alternatives. All you
27 have here is one project alternative. There are no
28 alternatives really when you look at it for most of the

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

43

1 routes of this project.

2 So I think you as the PUC members should send
3 these folks back to the drawing boards to create other
4 alternatives. The gentleman spoke of a few of them,
5 Antelope Valley, the Cajon Pass. And certainly there
6 will be impacts, but these need to be evaluated and
7 should be rightfully evaluated in a full information
8 document.

9 So, at any rate, we don't feel the EIR, I
10 don't feel the EIR is doing its job here. It is
11 negligent, it is probably unlawful under that
12 characterization.

13 Thank you very much.

14 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: If I'm mangle anybody's name when
15 I'm reading it out, I understand with a name like
16 Kolakowski, I get it all the time, I apologize
17 in advance.

18 STATEMENT OF MR. PRINDIVILLE

19 MR. PRINDIVILLE: I'm impressed you got it.

20 My name Jim Prindiville,
21 P-r-i-n-d-i-v-i-l-l-e.

22 This evening I'm speaking in favor of the
23 Alternative Route C that the City of Chino Hills has
24 proposed, and the positive effects that it would have on
25 the state park.

26 The CPUC requested an environmental impact
27 study. And the report has come back with what we
28 believe to be errors, half truths and incomplete

E.21-1,
cont.

E.22-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

44

1 information that very conveniently supports Edison's
2 proposed route.

**E.22-1,
cont.**

3 One very serious flaw in the Environmental
4 Impact Report is that it concludes the City's proposed
5 mitigation plan cannot be considered in connection with
6 the project, because it seeks to improve existing
7 conditions of the park instead of mitigating impacts
8 caused by the project. This is simply wrong.

E.22-2

9 Parts of the report indicate that Alternative
10 4C could have an impact on wildlife. However, those who
11 drafted this report did not take into consideration that
12 allowing the wildlife to have access to more protected
13 habitat forever may actually help them recover from any
14 destruction to their existing habitats during the few
15 months of construction.

16 Quite frankly, to not consider mitigation
17 plans, benefits of reducing or even reversing any impact
18 on wildlife is a flaw that will negatively affect the
19 Environmental Impact Report in a court of law. The
20 report must be altered to give full credence to the
21 City's mitigation plan.

E.22-3

22 The city of -- the Chino Hills State Park
23 General Plan identifies a core wildlife habitat within
24 the state park as well as several critical corridors
25 connecting the state park to the surrounding open
26 spaces. The corridors consist of Coal Canyon, Zone
27 Canyon, and the Prado Basin area.

28 The City's proposed restoration program

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

45

1 targets and rates areas based on several critical
2 criteria, including location relative to core habitat,
3 location relative to biocorridors, existing conditions
4 of habitat, presence of target species and potential to
5 support special status species.

6 Each of the three canyons that meet the
7 criteria will be over 300 feet that mark out the
8 approximate restoration area.

9 In preparing the plan, the 300-foot buffer was
10 determined using fundamental assessment standards. The
11 standards consider an aquatic feature with a 300-foot
12 buffer of native habitat as highly functional.

13 We encourage the CPUC, the Park Service and
14 Edison to closely review the proposed plans and
15 recognize the benefits for the state park positively
16 impacting both wildlife and those humans who enjoy the
17 park. The route proposed by Chino Hills includes
18 mitigation plan that is a one-time opportunity for the
19 park improvement that would benefit everyone.

20 I encourage the CPUC not to accept the route
21 proposed by Edison just for the sake of expediting this
22 project.

23 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

24 MR. COWARDIN: Okay.

25 STATEMENT OF MS. PRINDIVILLE

26 MS. PRINDIVILLE: Good evening.

27 My name is Denise Prindiville. I think you
28 already got our last name.

E.22-3,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

46

1 I'm here to just talk about one aspect that
2 would be of benefit in the mitigation plan. I agree
3 with all the other comments wholeheartedly, okay? I'm
4 just going to comment on the viewshed enhancement that
5 was listed, because that is actually a goal of the State
6 Parks Master Plan.

7 Our city staff has worked closely with
8 Southern California Edison to determine the existing
9 power poles that could be removed or relocated, so that
10 it would improve actually something in the state park.

11 The cost of this action is small in the scope
12 of this whole project. It dramatically improves the
13 aesthetics of the state park, so we want all these
14 points to be brought up.

15 There are approximately 10-1/2 miles of
16 inactive 220 volt line currently in the park that could
17 be and should be removed along with everything else that
18 is being considered this evening.

19 Chino Hills' alternative proposed route will
20 actually make the state park a better place for all of
21 us, not just a few, all of us. We strongly encourage
22 that the CPUC approve the proposal that was submitted by
23 Chino Hills and the removal plan for these inactive
24 lines that I'm referring to this evening. Make this
25 action part of the CPUC decision when deciding in favor
26 of the alternative route.

27 Someone actually said that Edison agreed years
28 ago to remove these lines, but they are still there.

E.23-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

47

1 The way to get rid of them is to include them in the
2 requirement order by the CPUC when it recommends that
3 alternative proposed route that Chino Hills has
4 submitted.

5 Thank you so much for hearing all of our
6 comments and all of our concerns this evening. We
7 really appreciate it.

8 STATEMENT OF MR. GOLEN

9 MR. GOLEN: Hi, my name is Turan Golen, T-u-r-a-n
10 G-o-l-e-n.

11 I'm here to speak on behalf of the good folks
12 of Chino Hills.

13 I am a professor of electrical engineering,
14 specifically electric power engineering, and teach in
15 transmission engineering at California State
16 University-Sacramento.

17 I have read the book Electric Transmission
18 System Engineering, which is used around the world in
19 many good universities as a textbook, engineering
20 textbook.

21 I have been teaching over 36 years electrical
22 power engineering in this country at six universities,
23 including California State University in Sacramento.
24 I've been in Sacramento over 24 years. Before that, I
25 have been practicing electric power engineer over eight
26 years in various companies, including design in
27 transmission lines and doing other projects. And I am a
28 fellow in area of power transmission and distribution

E.23-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

48

1 engineering.

2 Nowhere, as far as I know, nowhere in
3 California that have been -- neither I heard nor seen
4 nor in my research I came across that there have been a
5 study or project where there is an over 198-foot tower
6 for 500 kV lines in the residential areas using
7 right-of-way of 150 feet. That is simply not done.
8 There is one exception that is in Georgia where the line
9 was placed before the residential houses were built
10 around it. So those folks, they knew the risk involved
11 and voluntarily moved alongside the line. That was the
12 only exception in my study that I come across. Simply,
13 the right-of-way that is proposed has simply too narrow
14 for the purposes of 500 kV transmission lines.

15 To my knowledge, this issue has never been
16 properly, scholarly have been studied. And my guess is,
17 my estimated, educated guess is this is not done so,
18 because it is simply against the commonsense,
19 commonsense.

20 Other engineers --

21 (Laughter)

22 MR. GOLEN: -- may shown enough commonsense not to
23 do something crazy as this. Frankly, I'm shocked that
24 the engineers of Southern California Edison may --
25 probably I have had them in my classes one time or
26 another, will do so.

27 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Sir?

28 MR. GOLEN: In fact, they should know better.

E.24-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

49

1 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Sir, your time is up. I
2 appreciate it, but your time is up. So could you wrap
3 up now?

4 MR. GOLEN: Thank you.

5 This is dangerous, even with the details and
6 geographical studies done prior to construction.
7 Geological hazards are unpredictable, and towers which
8 are 195 feet tall with 160 feet wingspan may have to
9 stand ground shaking due to the earthquake and
10 landslides. The chances of those poles falling is not
11 zero. It could happen. Not every (inaudible) away.
12 For example, 1800 towers, SCE towers, collapsed in
13 January of 1994.

E.24-2

14 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much. I really
15 look forward to looking at -- I hope that you will
16 provide written testimony for the EIR process. And
17 hopefully we will also see you in your evidentiary
18 hearings as well. But your time is up now, and so I
19 would like to move on to other people in the community.

20 MR. GOLEN: Thank you. I'm looking forward to do
21 so. Thank you.

22 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Next we have Aziz Amiri.

23 STATEMENT OF MR. AMIRI

24 MR. AMIRI: Thank you, Commissioner.

25 My name is Aziz Amiri, that is spelled
26 A-z-i-z, last name is A-m-i-r-i.

27 I'm the Executive Director of Aegis Senior
28 Living, a residential care facility located on Peyton

E.25-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

50

1 Drive which is located within 500 feet of the proposed
2 line.

3 I'm here to oppose it on behalf of 120
4 residents. Lucky that they send me tonight, they would
5 have come down here charging with their canes.

6 (Laughter)

7 MR. AMIRI: As you know, in our facilities elderly
8 reside. They are faced with chronic diseases on a
9 day-to-day basis in these facilities for the latter part
10 of their life, for quality of life. And I believe this
11 proposed project puts them in direct jeopardy of health
12 and well-being. These residents do not have any
13 alternative but to live where they live.

14 Also, the few feet within the power line is
15 where they recreate, they walk, they walk their dog,
16 they go to the park. In fact, the church is within a
17 few hundred yards of these power lines.

18 So this will have adverse effect on the
19 quality of life. I hope you think of those charging
20 canes when you vote on this.

21 Thank you.

22 STATEMENT OF MR. TEATER

23 MR. TEATER: Good evening.

24 My name is Andrew Teater, T-e-a-t-e-r. I'm
25 also a resident of Chino Hills.

26 First of all, I would like to address just
27 some OSHA rules I pulled off the website. I work with
28 telecommunications systems, Fujitsu, NORAD, Nortel,

E.25-1,
cont.

E.26-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

51

1 Fujitsu, FlashPlay. I deal with voltage.

2 People die. About 100 people that work on
3 power lines die each year, according to OSHA. OSHA
4 website shows facilities from general contractor power
5 lines, tree trimming, roofing. Power lines kill. OSHA
6 shows this and Edison shows this.

7 According to the National Institute of
8 Occupational Safety & Health, NIOSH, it actually quotes
9 as a guideline you can be shocked or killed. The
10 distance of safety is 10 feet plus 4 inches for every
11 10 kilovolts over 10 kilovolts. You need to recognize
12 that overhead power lines is a hazard. That is about
13 460 feet, right-of-way is 75.

14 So it could not have been recently
15 contemplated back in 1947 when the easement was created
16 that they would support 500-kilovolt power lines. I
17 think Edison is risking its ability to build
18 transmission lines in any other location where they want
19 to upgrade for transmission.

20 They are trying to force this through Chino
21 Hills perhaps to teach other cities a lesson. Edison
22 risks the entire reliability of their network. This is
23 unwise.

24 The City of Chino Hills filed a lawsuit
25 challenging this right. I intend to litigate. I think
26 there are some parties that intend to litigate here too.

27 But just to kind of stop the hate a little
28 bit, I would like to be a little bit more positive.

E.26-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

52

1 That is the Alternative 4C, this is basically a state
2 park expansion which removes 67 towers, reduces 12.5
3 miles of transmission lines. Removes the unused 220 kV
4 towers, relocates some of the towers off of the ridge
5 line and connects the park, the Prado Basin Reserve, to
6 allow greater bioconnectivity. We are going green, we
7 hope.

**E.26-1,
cont.**

8 Just to follow-up on Jim Prindiville's
9 statement, the mitigation plan with Alternative 4C
10 results in the removal of more transmission lines on the
11 park in addition to the 220 kV line to be rerouted
12 outside the park. And must follow removal of the lines
13 to mitigate the impact of the small amount of additional
14 towers or right-of-way for the 500 kV line that would be
15 added on the existing lines to be added to take off the
16 ridgetops and screen behind the hillside.

E.26-2

17 To say that the viewshed enhancement only
18 affects the existing condition and doesn't mitigate
19 impacts of the project is just wrong and is pure
20 nonsense.

E.26-3

21 Look at your own visual simulation. There is
22 that force route simulation. That looked nice, that was
23 a good thing. There are a few towers in the water.

24 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you, your time is up.

25 MR. TEATER: Thank you.

26 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Brad Franklin, Melanie
27 Schlotterbeck and Claire Schlotterbeck.

28 STATEMENT OF MR. FRANKLIN

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

53

1 MR. FRANKLIN: Good evening.

2 Brad Franklin, Chino Hills resident.

3 I'm going to speak to the condemnation route.

4 If you were to take the condemnation route, you would
5 basically end up spending around \$61 million to condemn
6 homes along this route. This makes the project far more
7 expensive than any of the other alternatives, and makes
8 it much more attractive as to the cost differential.

9 Also, I would like to speak to the comment
10 made earlier on Chino Hills being an economic engine of
11 the Inland Empire. Just because we have a very educated
12 populus, it attracts industry that needs these workers
13 in our area. To destroy the quality of life that we
14 built here in Chino Hills is going to stab the knife in
15 the economic engine. Workforce will vanish, and with it
16 the chance to lead economic recovery in the Inland
17 Empire.

18 Please take a look at this again, review it
19 carefully and make the proper decision.

20 Thank you very much.

21 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

22 Melanie Schlotterbeck, Claire Schlotterbeck
23 and Al Matta.

24 STATEMENT OF MS. MELANIE SCHLOTTERBECK

25 MS. SCHLOTTERBECK: Good evening.

26 My name is Melanie Schlotterbeck,
27 S-c-h-l-o-t-t-e-r-b-e-c-k. I'm a technical consultant
28 for Hills For Everyone, the group that founded Chino

E.27-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

54

1 Hills State Park.

2 Since we are limited to three minutes, I'm
3 going to tag team with Claire Schlotterbeck, the
4 Executive Director of Hills For Everyone.

5 For the past 32 years, the mission of Hills
6 For Everyone has been protecting unique, rare
7 disappearing natural lands of this region. Our earliest
8 mission was the creation of the park, but when we came
9 to understand the principles of conservation biology and
10 the importance of connecting resource lands, we expanded
11 our mission to include the protection of the entire
12 Puente-Chino Hills Wildlife Corridor of which the state
13 park is the anchor parcel.

14 These hills are prized for their
15 well-documented natural resource values as evidenced by
16 their inclusion as just one of 26 global hotspots of
17 biodiversity and their designation --

18 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: We seem to have lost the lights.
19 Somebody is leaning against them.

20 Thank you.

21 MS. SCHLOTTERBECK: Sure.

22 So 26 global hotspots and their designation by
23 the United States Fish & Wildlife Service as critical
24 habitat of the California Gnatcatcher.

25 The resources in these hills have convinced
26 the State of California and other resource agencies to
27 spend hundreds of million dollars in protecting 18,000
28 acres of this wonderful landscape. These protected

E.28-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

55

1 lands lie within an hour's drive of over half the
2 state's population. The park provides opportunity for a
3 wilderness experience for those who might not otherwise
4 be able to afford a visit to a more distant state park.

E.28-1,
cont.

5 We designed the park along ridgeline
6 boundaries so that urban weary visitors could get away
7 from the sights and sounds of urban life. We have also
8 prioritized protecting land first, believing amenities
9 can wait. Because without all of the ridgeline
10 protected a sustainable ecosystem function would be
11 lost.

E.28-2

12 We take seriously the settlement agreement
13 that we reached with Edison in 1982. We appreciate
14 their letter to Director Ruth Coleman confirming their
15 intention to remove the unused, old line and northern
16 extension.

17 In spring of 2006, Hills For Everyone became
18 engaged in the process with the Orange County
19 Transportation Authority to develop a comprehensive
20 programmatic mitigation package for inclusion into
21 renewed sales tax measure, Measure M. Ultimately, a
22 minimum of 5 percent of the freeway program was
23 designated for habitat mitigation. Rather than provide
24 a piecemeal approach to mitigation, this agreement pools
25 the mitigation so that long-lasting landscape level
26 mitigation can be achieved with a net environmental
27 benefit. That outcome and process may be instructive in
28 this case.

E.28-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

56

1 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

2 Claire Schlotterbeck, Al Matta.

3 STATEMENT OF MS. CLAIRE SCHLOTTERBECK

4 MS. SCHLOTTERBECK: Good evening.

5 My name is Claire Schlotterbeck, Executive
6 Director of Hills For Everyone.

7 I would like to preface my remarks with just a
8 couple of comments. I have to say I have never before,
9 I've been doing this for 30 something years, I've never
10 been before a panel of mostly women. And I can't tell
11 you how lovely it is.

12 I would also like to support the comments that
13 have been made by the La Habra Heights residents and
14 councilmembers and the Whittier residents who are our
15 partners across the hills.

16 And, finally, I would like to say I'm
17 disappointed at the treatment of Ron Rowe, State Park
18 Superintendent, who is an old friend, a professional.
19 It is disappointing to see that he was treated as he
20 was, because he does a great job as a public servant.

21 When the City of Chino Hills proposed more
22 transmission lines in the state park, our board's
23 unanimous, initial reaction was one of outrage. We have
24 witnessed this city's cavalier attitude for the park for
25 years. So it was with considerable reluctance and
26 resentment we began to try to fairly evaluate their
27 proposal with a less jaundiced eye.

28 The EIR didn't take us very far into that

E.29-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

57

1 evaluation. The base map upon which the alternatives
2 were drawn is outdated by years, thereby changing a
3 fundamental description of the existing conditions.
4 There are also a few imperative simulations which would
5 give a sense of what the new towers would look like from
6 a variety of perspectives. We can only guess.

E.29-1,
cont.

7 Furthermore, there is little discussion in the
8 EIR of the mitigation proposal put forth by the City.
9 None of the alternatives work without the kind of
10 comprehensive mitigation package proposed by Chino
11 Hills. Some hybrid of the alternatives might work with
12 a mitigation package and worth further consideration.
13 We urge the DEIR be recirculated to provide a genuine
14 discussion of alternatives as CEQA requires.

15 Though initially put (inaudible), our position
16 now and understanding has evolved as we talked and
17 toured and we reflected individually and as a board. In
18 short, we do not look upon our position lightly.

E.29-2

19 The ultimate question has always been what is
20 best for the land, what best assures a sustainable
21 future for the park. We believe that some hybrid of
22 Alternative B and C, coupled with comprehensive
23 programmatic mitigation package could provide a net
24 environmental benefit to the state park over the long
25 term. It is our judgment that this benefit has the
26 potential to outweigh negative impacts of an additional
27 power line.

28 We understand how other like-minded groups may

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

58

1 have come to the conclusion. But at the end of the day,
2 we are the group that has created the state park and has
3 been on the ground for 32 years. We are the group that
4 followed every one of the 33 acquisitions, and has
5 reached across county and party lines to collaborate.
6 We are the group that has historically accepted a place
7 to protect the park. We know this park, our eyes rests
8 on its ridgelines every day.

**E.29-2,
cont.**

9 Our attorneys at Shute Mihaly and Weinberger
10 will be sending in formal comments on the DEIR on
11 April 6th.

12 Thank you.

13 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

14 STATEMENT OF MR. MATTA

15 MR. MATTA: My name is Al Matta, M-a-t-t-a.

16 And I would just like to put a little humor in
17 this. President Obama, I have something he does not
18 have. I have my degree from Occidental College.

19 (Laughter)

20 MR. MATTA: Now, on facts, primarily I'm one for
21 safety. I would like to say that the lines that come
22 in, I live right next to -- it is in my backyard. I
23 live off Eucalyptus. The potential dropping of my home
24 will be 10 to 20 percent. Now, I am not a
25 multibillionaire. So that is a lot of money to me and
26 my neighbors.

E.30-1

27 I went online, I saw these videos from these
28 big, big towers where several hundred people or couple

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

59

1 hundred took the fluorescent lights, went towards the
2 tower, and they all lit up. Now, to me that is a red
3 flag. Chino Hills State Park, which I love, has
4 animals. We visit, we don't live there. We cannot move
5 like that (indicating) because of the lines.

6 Somebody says there is going to be 10 extra
7 miles, oh, my God, 10 extra miles? We are going to go
8 bankrupt. After all, we have several thousand lines.
9 So what is a little infinitesimal amount of 10 miles
10 versus everything.

11 And as people have said before, 500 K lines
12 are nowhere near residents. Somebody mentioned Georgia.

13 Chino Hills is a home for people. It is not
14 an experiment for high voltage.

15 I worked in Compton, gladly I'm retired. I
16 worked at the school for 33 years as a physical
17 education instructor and a coach. We had high tension
18 wires. Our school had the highest death rate, the
19 highest sickness rate. And the corridor, all the homes
20 along the corridor along those lines, we had the highest
21 absenteeism. But everybody said from the power lines it
22 has not been proven that this causes sickness.

23 Well, guess what, ladies and gentlemen, it has
24 also been proven that if you jump off a cliff, you will
25 not get killed. In that scenario, they let one
26 important thing out, the landing. Once those land in my
27 backyard, that is when the health issue comes up.

28 My grandchild who I love dearly, who goes to

E.30-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

60

1 school in this area, I want him to have a safe, healthy
2 life.

3 One lady talked about her asthma, I had it, I
4 had an asthma son. And I can see what she is going
5 through.

6 In Washington D.C. there was an important
7 document, and it says -- it does not say for the
8 committee and by the committee, it says "For the People"
9 and "By the People." And the people here are asking you
10 to use the alternate route, because we don't want to be
11 the experiment.

12 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

13 STATEMENT OF MR. KUETHEN

14 MR. KUETHEN: Good evening.

15 My name is Scott Kuethen, that is spelled
16 K-u-e-t-h-e-n. Everybody has mispronounced it all my
17 life, it is okay.

18 I'm a Chino Hills resident, and I'm here
19 representing the Chino Hills Valley Community Church.
20 With over 11 acres of land, I believe we are the single
21 largest private property owner affected by this project.
22 We've owned the property since 1994, occupied May 1999.

23 There is current easement running east-west
24 for our property. It is 150 feet wide by approximately
25 600 feet long. Currently we have parking there.

26 Before we purchased the property, we spoke
27 with Edison licensing specialist, a Joe Diamonto. He
28 confirmed the easement wouldn't any permanent

**E.30-2,
cont.**

E.31-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

61

1 structures. However, he also told us parking lots were
2 allowed, which our master plan was designed that way.

3 We've enjoyed a long and good relationship
4 with Edison. They've accessed there and done
5 inspection, maintenance, and whatnot, on our property.
6 We have nothing against Edison.

7 As a church we represent approximately 1200
8 people in our regular church programs every week. In
9 addition to our church programs and church use there are
10 sports fields and sports used by the AYSO. There is
11 various little league and softball leagues. We also
12 offer a variety of other community programs that happen
13 on our property every week.

14 If you do the math, over 80,000 people touch
15 our property and visit the property every year. This
16 doesn't even include sports teams and spectators. As a
17 church, we are woven into the fabric of this community.

18 A project that negatively impacts our church
19 campus negatively impacts our community. As stewards of
20 the property, we have an obligation to protect everyone
21 in our campus. So we have some concerns.

22 The easement width, the structural failure
23 could easily result in damage outside the current
24 150 feet easement area. Using eminent domain to extend
25 the easement would severely limit the use of our campus.
26 This could effectively cause irreparable harm to our
27 function and purpose as a nonprofit contributor to our
28 community. We think that is imprudent and unreasonable.

E.31-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

62

1 The structural earthquake considerations, you
2 know that there is earthquake, an active earthquake
3 fault running through Chino Hills.

4 The proposed structures have apparently
5 experienced past failures. Although when we asked this
6 of Edison, asked this question, we can't get a simple
7 yes or no answer. That in itself is awful.

E.31-2

8 In our view, constructing single line pole
9 transmission carriers, a backbone of the system, in
10 heavily populated, in a known earthquake fault area, is
11 an invitation for disaster. No one, no one here will be
12 safe from health, from a health prospective.

13 The cost issue, the difference between what
14 the City has proposed and what Edison has proposed is
15 using Edison's higher number of \$150 million spread out
16 over 4.5 million ratepayers comes to \$33 a person. That
17 amortized over 20 years is what Edison does, comes out
18 to \$1.67 per year, per ratepayer.

E.31-3

19 We share Edison's vision for renewable energy
20 added to the power grid. We also share Edison's desire
21 to accomplish this in an effective and efficient
22 environmentally responsible manner. We love the
23 environment.

E.31-4

24 Please choose to protect people. Please
25 choose to protect the environment. Please choose the
26 City of Chino Hills' Route 4C.

27 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

28 We still have about 20 people. We are

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

63

1 scheduled to end in 13 minutes. I'm sure the City would
2 be willing to let us stay here a little bit longer than
3 we originally agreed. Even so, with that many people
4 for three minutes at a time, if we can't things moving
5 along, people continue to run over, we will be here all
6 night. I don't think that that is what everybody wants.

7 STATEMENT OF MR. SCHEIBER

8 MR. SCHEIBER: I'm under three minutes.

9 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Great. So I have Alan Scheiber,
10 Scott Guiou, Joyce Butler.

11 MR. SCHEIBER: Alan Scheiber, S-c-h-e-i-b-e-r.

12 I own a business in Chino Hills. I shop in
13 Chino Hills. But more importantly, I live in Chino
14 Hills.

15 We live on Newport Drive, about 150 yards away
16 from where these towers are going.

17 For the last 10 years my wife has suffered
18 from a rare disease called dystonia. Because of that
19 disease, she went through a series of brain surgeries
20 last year, three brain surgeries where they implant
21 wires in her head.

22 She has batteries in her chest which are
23 highly susceptible to magnetic forces. She cannot walk
24 through an airport without setting off alarms. Nobody
25 is able to tell me what the impact of this magnetic
26 force is and what it is going to do to her.

27 I don't know what to do right now. If we
28 should sell the house, or move, wait to see what

E.32-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

64

1 happens. I don't think Southern California Edison is
2 willing to take on her medical costs if something goes
3 wrong. I'm not sure what to do.

4 So I need your help to save her life. I'm
5 more worried more about my life than a bird or a fish.

6 Thank you.

7 STATEMENT OF MR. GUIOU

8 MR. GUIOU: My name is Scott Guiou, G-u-i-o-u.

9 And I live in Chino Hills.

10 I understand the need to develop renewable
11 energy. I understand that Edison is mandated by the
12 state to produce 20 percent of their total energy by
13 renewable resources.

14 And I understand opinions vary widely on the
15 detrimental effects magnetic fields have on human health
16 as evidenced by the much more stringent limits required
17 by European countries. I just don't want to raise my
18 family in the shadow of a 200-foot long tower being
19 exposed to 500 kilovolts on a daily basis while the
20 research catches up with the technology.

21 When the 150-foot easement running through
22 Chino Hills was created, it was open ranchland with
23 nothing to restrict it.

24 Granted, no one can see the future. But as
25 the community dances around it, Edison should have had
26 foresight to increase the size of the easement. Trying
27 to put this project in this easement is like landing a
28 modern airliner at Chino Airport. The airport wasn't

**E.32-1,
cont.**

E.33-1

E.33-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

65

1 made to accommodate such aircraft. That doesn't mean
2 you couldn't land an airliner there, it just means it
3 would be unsafe to do so. A terrible accident would
4 prove that out.

5 Let's not wait for something terrible to
6 happen in our neighborhood to prove this project doesn't
7 belong here. The City of Chino Hills has come up with a
8 safe and feasible alternate route. I think everyone's
9 time and resources would best be used by working out a
10 compromise to develop this route.

11 Thank you.

12 STATEMENT OF MS. WILKINS

13 MS. WILKINS: Good evening.

14 My name is Sharon Wilkins, and I'm speaking on
15 behalf of Joyce Butler.

16 The DEIR talked about the Alternative 4C can
17 impact recreational uses in the park, and impact
18 utilities and public service in or near the park.
19 Improving the visitor infrastructure of the park and
20 providing funds to maintain facilities is clearly a
21 mitigation measure that directly offsets the supposed
22 negative impacts.

23 The point is that all of the most important
24 impacts attributed to Alternate 4C are significantly
25 mitigated by the proposed mitigation plan. And the DEIR
26 has to be changed to recognize that it is a legally
27 effective document, and you will be waisting your time,
28 Edison's time, and our time, if you issue a decision

E.33-2,
cont.

E.34-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

66

1 with an EIR like that, because it won't stand up in
2 court.

3 Alternate 4C is not too costly. Southern
4 California Edison says that our route is \$50 million
5 more expensive than the original route. Our expert who
6 was an Encino transmission planner says our route will
7 cost no more than Southern California Edison route, and
8 they are the same cost.

**E.34-1,
cont.**

9 In meeting with Southern California Edison a
10 transmission planner admitted that our cost estimates
11 are just as correct as his cost estimates. So the
12 incremental cost of our Alternative 4C could very well
13 be zero, and the only additional cost would be
14 \$50 million mitigation plan, which is well worth it to
15 avoid the damage to our community and improve the park
16 at the same time.

17 On behalf of myself, I'm also -- I looked at
18 the Tehachapi Renewable Transmission, and I noticed that
19 Loyola High School, Litel Elementary, Chino Valley
20 Community Church was on this piece of paper. But there
21 is no mention on this piece of paper about the LDS
22 Church, which it has two buildings close to that
23 property. Nothing mentioned about the catholic church
24 just down the other way.

E.34-2

25 And I feel that that -- those things will also
26 be impacted.

27 Thank you.

28 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Magdi Demin, Gabriel Hernandez

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

67

1 and Fred, and I can't make out the last name, N-e-a-n.

2 STATEMENT OF MR. DEMIN

3 MR. DEMIN: Good evening.

4 My name is -- my last name is D-e-m-i-n.

5 I collected some facts in terms of this
6 project. First, the man should come before the animal.

7 As we are residents of Chino --
8 (Applause)

9 MR. DEMIN: We use the park for primary reason for
10 us.

11 Secondly, we -- I have the comment from the
12 state park. And we knew in fact that there is
13 500-kilovolt line in the state park right now. And
14 there is even better route, the route to be on the
15 border of the state park, as far as they are concerned.

16 I have a little study regarding the schools,
17 and schools here, they are by high voltage. And
18 according to the California Code cited by Section 14,
19 Table 10, Division 1, Chapter 13, Subchapter 1, Article
20 2, Item 4, line E and M, stated that 100 feet for --
21 100 feet is reasonable for 50-150 kilovolt. 150 feet,
22 according to our situation, is suitable for 220 to 230
23 kilovolt, and if -- 350 feet is suitable for 550
24 kilovolt.

25 According to this fact, according to the code,
26 according to our kids being in schools, and if you --
27 with simple calculations that I did, kids, our kids stay
28 in school one fifth, there, days, and hours over the

E.35-1

E.35-2

E.35-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

68

1 year.

2 So as that matter, stay at home five times as
3 they stay at school. And if the school code, according
4 to that, for the safety of the kids, and the safety of
5 the students, call for 350 feet in terms of 500
6 kilovolt. We argue the compatible of the reason of the
7 same student being at home and same safety as the code
8 of other schools concerning that, according to the
9 health code, (inaudible) according to when the kids are
10 in school.

**E.35-3,
cont.**

11 The other issue is Chino Hills is seismically
12 active. There was a 5.4 earthquake centered in Chino
13 Hills in July 2008. And school is number one. Then
14 earthquake had code figure before like in the north
15 district. This is not as much a risk in open country,
16 but narrowest right-of-way in the (inaudible) people is
17 serious risk that CPU should not force on this
18 community.

E.35-4

19 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

20 I have here Gabriel Hernandez and Fred Heene.

21 STATEMENT OF MR. HERNANDEZ

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Hello, my name is Gabriel
23 Hernandez. I'm a Chino Hills resident.

24 As I'm sure you are aware, Chino Hills has
25 proposed the mitigation plan which makes use of cost
26 savings from the shorter transmission line to fund
27 critical improvements for Chino Hills State Park, all of
28 which are consistent with the park's master plan.

E.36-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

69

1 Alternative 4C helps reduce the impact of
2 transmission lines within the park, a major goal of the
3 master plan, by removing up to 67 transmission towers at
4 up to 12-1/2 miles of transmission lines from the park
5 by completely removing all existing transmission lines
6 from the sensitive Water Canyon Natural Preserve within
7 the park, and relocating portions of the remaining
8 transmission lines to side hill locations where they are
9 far less visible to park visitors.

E.36-2

10 We also want the CPUC -- we would like them to
11 mandate that SCE remove the other unused 220 kV lines
12 running through the park. If those are removed, the net
13 effect of the Chino Hills alternative will dramatically
14 reduce the footprint of power lines in the park.

15 Thank you very much.

16 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

17 Fred, he will give his name, then Kyle Tejada,
18 Mindy Inselberg.

19 STATEMENT OF MR. HEENE

20 MR. HEENE: Thank you.

21 In the past, nobody would, in this room
22 probably, have mispronounced my name, because they have
23 heard it many times. It is Heene.

24 I'm a 37-year resident of this area. I'm one
25 of the founding fathers of this city when it first
26 started. I have been very active in this city and area.

27 I live up against this easement. I bought a
28 house up against this easement when the easement was

E.37-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

70

1 well known to all of us. We factored in the fact that
2 it was an 85-foot tower, we had 75 feet to our line. So
3 maybe 10-foot might bother us.

4 If you look at that same line now, and I'm
5 factoring moving into that house, I'm looking at the
6 idea that approximately 100 or more feet will fall past
7 my house, and over into the street and possibly into
8 another house.

9 That is not safe for anyone, especially if
10 these are live lines at the time, 100 or 500 kilowatts,
11 whatever they might be. That is a whole lot of
12 electrical juice going down the line.

13 I do tonight take some umbrage at the fact
14 that only one Commissioner is here present to hear these
15 wonderful, eloquent people whose passionate plea is to
16 come before you. I'm happy to hear that the one went to
17 his jury duty, and that is a good civic duty. But I can
18 only pray that the staff takes back some of the
19 enthusiasm and some of the intelligent comments that are
20 being made here.

21 We fear for our safety. We fear for our lives
22 and our children's lives. And those take far more
23 precedence than some poppies and some coyotes.

24 (Applause)

25 MR. HEENE: Everybody here supports the Tehachapi
26 Project and what it is supposed to do. Everybody also
27 understands that you are looking at the idea of
28 sentencing us to having ultra frequencies in our area,

E.37-1,
cont.

E.37-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

71

1 high voltage lines and towers that can fall over and not
2 only devastate us and our families, but the family
3 across the street. I think that is wrong. I think that
4 is not proper. And I think that we are all asking you
5 to go back to the drawing board and find another way.

E.37-2,
cont.

6 We've tried to do our homework. And I'm sure
7 that you will find those easements are in fact possibly
8 overburdened and that may become some other issue.

E.37-3

9 Thank you.

10 STATEMENT OF MR. TEJADA

11 MR. TEJADA: Good evening.

12 I'm Kyle Tejada. I'm 14.

13 And this is my little brother, Brian Tejada,
14 and he is 8; and this is my little sister, Alisa Tejada,
15 she is 10; and over there is the rest of my family.

16 And I would like to say that we all here do
17 support keeping those power lines out of our backyards.

18 Now, I've lived in this great city of Chino
19 Hills all my life. I'm sure many of these people here
20 share my good sentiments. I work hard at school, and so
21 do many of these other great people here.

E.38-1

22 And we are in a recession right now. Some of
23 us are hanging by the threads. Almost everyone is
24 suffering right now. We don't need something else to
25 worry about.

26 The power lines are currently an eyesore, and
27 upgrading them will only make them more so. Our
28 neighborhood is quiet, peaceful one. And I don't see

E.38-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

72

1 how these power lines will improve that, or the
2 construction, for that matter. Currently there is no
3 traffic and little noise in our neighborhood. The
4 construction process will bring noise, dust and traffic
5 to our surrounding neighborhood. And if construction
6 drags on for months, and nobody wants to be next to the
7 construction sight for even a few days.

**E.38-2,
cont.**

8 And that reminds me, my house is right next to
9 the current right-of-way. I measured it, and my house
10 is just about 30 feet away from the right-of-way. That
11 makes my house about 105 feet away where the power lines
12 will be. In fact, that makes all those houses right
13 next to the right-of-way 100 to 120 feet away from the
14 power lines.

E.38-3

E.38-4

15 Plus, what happens if the towers fall over?
16 They would take out at least one house in any direction
17 and almost any direction they fall over. Those wires,
18 if they break, these winds around here, they can easily
19 land them on top of somebody's house or in their
20 backyard.

E.38-5

21 Now, I like clean energy. In fact, I love it.
22 I congratulate Edison for its efforts to incorporate
23 clean wind power to Southern California Energy grid.
24 But one solution must not directly create other problems
25 to so many people.

E.38-6

26 I remember the EIR report says Chino Hills
27 Alternative 4 was not recommended. The route will go
28 through the state park instead of our backyards. Well,

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

73

1 you know what the bottom line is, that says they would
2 rather put the power lines over those wolves, squirrels
3 and birds in the state park instead of over us, the
4 citizens of the United States and California.

5 Now, you think actually those squirrels
6 rabbits and birds are more important than these
7 citizens? Is anybody here going to actually admit that?

8 Plus, we spend more than half of our day in
9 our homes. Can you find anybody that spends as much
10 time in the state park, seriously? We are spending
11 more --

12 (Applause)

13 MR. TEJADA: I found this new study called
14 Interphone. It says that using cell phones regularly
15 could give you a 50 percent higher risk of brain cancer.
16 That study says cell phones give out the same thing that
17 these power lines give, the power lines would be
18 stronger. Hey, you are putting us under these things,
19 and we're going to be the experiment.

20 My grandfather has a pacemaker. That is a
21 highly sensitive electronic device that keeps his heart
22 breathing, keeps him alive. If these power lines are
23 put in, he couldn't even visit our house let alone stay
24 here for a while.

25 There is a setback limit for schools, why
26 isn't there a setback limit for homes?

27 We are fighting for our families, our brothers
28 and our sisters, our homes and ourselves. We are the

E.38-6,
cont.

E.38-7

E.38-8

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

74

1 future generation of Chino Hills. We are homeowners.

2 We are future homeowners.

3 We are the people that oppose these 500
4 kilovolt power lines in the heart of our city. They
5 will uproot our neighborhood, devalue our homes,
6 endanger the lives of our loved ones, and spoil our
7 reputation. They will cut straight through the corridor
8 of our great community.

9 If these are built in our backyard, I don't
10 think I would want to live in this city that I've called
11 home for all my life. I've seen my parents struggle to
12 try to build and buy -- to buy a house away from the
13 500-kilovolt transmission lines during these trying
14 economic times. No one would want to buy our house, no
15 one would want to buy anybody's house around here.

16 I believe that when all of this is said and
17 done, the city of Chino Hills and the people of Chino
18 Hills will prevail, we will win. This is not --

19 (Applause)

20 MR. TEJADA: -- not by our schools, not by our
21 neighborhood (applause) (inaudible).

22 God bless America and God bless Chino Hills.

23 Thank you very much.

24 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Tejada, and your
25 family. I can see that Chino Hills has quite a future.

26 (Laughter)

27 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Mindy Inselberg, Marci Kuethen
28 and Stephen Headley.

**E.38-8,
cont.**

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

75

1 STATEMENT OF MS. INSELBERG

2 MS. INSELBERG: Good evening.

3 My name is Mindy Inselberg. Tough act to
4 follow.

5 In the interest of time, I'll keep this very
6 short. I am a 16-year resident here in Chino Hills. I
7 have three children. I do not live directly next to
8 where this project is proposed to go. I am very
9 concerned, however, for my neighbors, my neighborhood,
10 my community and anyone who visits us.

11 I am employed with the University of
12 California-Irvine. I work primarily for the Cancer
13 Center. Our patient load has increased 16 percent over
14 the past four years. We are the only designated cancer
15 center, comprehensive cancer in Orange County. And we
16 are also designated to serve the Inland Empire.

17 I am afraid, I'm scared for the people of the
18 Inland Empire who may be living next to these power
19 lines.

20 Working for the Cancer Center is rewarding and
21 exciting research education and clinical care. I've had
22 the opportunity to work with occupational, environmental
23 health division as well as the cancer center. I've seen
24 research, white paper studies, all kinds of reviews.
25 Ive had an opportunity to rub elbows with some of the
26 smartest men and women in our area. We are working on
27 cancer projects, whether or not it is early prevention,
28 detection or treatment.

E.39-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

76

1 Now, as we all know, there are no significant
2 facts available that absolutely prove electromagnetic
3 fields definitively cause cancer, but commonsense,
4 people, commonsense says otherwise.

5 Of the 300-plus facility and staff members at
6 our cancer center, a very high percentage of us, of my
7 coworkers are highly suspicious that continued exposure
8 to electromagnetic fields influence the health of human
9 beings. With the quality and quantity of research
10 currently being worked on, surely our researchers will
11 find that definitive link.

12 I ask you please to consider the human beings
13 in this project.

14 Thank you.

15 STATEMENT OF MS. KUETHEN

16 MS. KUETHEN: Hi, my name is Marci Kuethen,
17 K-u-e-t-h-e-n.

18 Good evening.

19 I'm concerned about the many losses that will
20 occur in our backyards if you allow the current plan to
21 pass, especially if the easement must be increased for
22 safety reasons.

23 My church, Chino Hills Community Church, could
24 lose over a third of its parking lot. This is a huge
25 loss to us, and negatively impacts our ministries and
26 our ability to build a new sanctuary. We need to
27 address our parking needs first.

28 Of course you heard the losses of other

**E.39-1,
cont.**

E.40-1

E.40-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

77

1 residents.

E.40-2,
cont.

2 Imagine if this proposed line were going in
3 your backyard. Would you go for it, especially knowing
4 that another route is available that is safer, costs
5 about the same, would not be an eyesore? Alternate 4C
6 is such a route.

7 I ask you to please treat our backyards like
8 they are your backyard. Please say no to unsafe
9 198-foot towers on our streets, park and behind the
10 homes of citizens represented here today. It is up to
11 you, it is your job to protect our backyards and choose
12 the better, safer route.

E.40-3

13 STATEMENT OF MR. HEADLEY

14 MR. HEADLEY: Thank you. My name is Stephen
15 Headley, H-e-a-d-l-e-y.

16 I've been a resident in Chino Hills for more
17 than 20 years. I come here tonight as a former Parks
18 and Reaction Commissioner for the City of Chino Hills.

19 I'm going to try to cut to the chase the best
20 I can. I'm in support of Chino Hills Alternate 4C. I
21 believe my perspective is ideal, because I'm worried
22 about the large tower and extremely high voltage line in
23 the heart of our community, but also care and use of the
24 Chino Hills State Park.

E.41-1

25 One of the most important features of the
26 mitigation plan proposed by the City of Chino Hills
27 would incur the purchase of undeveloped land that would
28 connect the park to the Prado Basin Reserve to the east

E.41-2

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

78

1 creating a large, viable corridor to allow wildlife to
2 migrate between these two expansive protected areas.

3 This is consistent with a major goal of the
4 parks master plan and will represent significant benefit
5 to offset any destruction to wildlife by the activity
6 involved in relocating some transmission lines and the
7 removal of others.

**E.41-2,
cont.**

8 The biological corridor allows a variety of
9 rare species, bobcats, mountain lions and a variety of
10 species, to avoid becoming trapped and isolated in
11 patches of habitat. When small patches of wilderness
12 are cut off from other open space areas, many species
13 remain present at the time of isolation and inevitably
14 seek new habitat which endanger people as identified by
15 the coyote attack in the Chino Hills Park just months
16 ago.

E.41-3

17 Biological corridors help to maintain healthy
18 populations of plants and animals by allowing genetic
19 exchange, migration and repopulating after a catastrophe
20 such as fires. The city identified various undeveloped
21 parcels of land east of the state parks totaling
22 2517 acres. Given the current challenges, these
23 properties are not good candidates for future
24 development.

25 The biocorridor expansion component also
26 includes the construction of a wildlife crossing that
27 would travel under the State Route 71 into Prado Basin
28 area. The Prado Basin contains nearly 10,300 which will

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

79

1 remain as permanent and open space.

E.41-3,
cont.

2 The City of Chino Hills is also operating part
3 of the expansion component to provide the citizens of
4 the state park the acquisition of these properties.
5 This assistance would include all aspects of real
6 property acquisition and the process.

E.41-4

7 Please understand that we are all in support
8 of Tehachapi Renewable Transmission Project. However,
9 we feel the placement of the lines in the original
10 proposal poses undue risk in the health and welfare of
11 our community, which can be averted with the adoption of
12 the Chino Hills Alternative.

E.41-5

13 Thank you for your time and consideration.

14 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Stephen Burns, Janet Headley and
15 then Louis Bouwer.

16 STATEMENT OF MS. HEADLEY

17 MS. HEADLEY: Hi, my name is Janet Headley,
18 H-e-a-d-l-e-y. I've been a resident of Chino Hills for
19 22 years.

20 The cost of the proposed mitigation are not
21 too much for a small community. Money spent in Chino
22 Hills State Park benefits the entire Inland Empire. The
23 park is a refuge not only for animals and plants, but
24 also those who strive to maintain natural space.

E.42-1

25 Chino Hills State Park is the largest such
26 park in Southern California, and also one of the most
27 important wildlife habitats in the area. Expanding the
28 park and linking it to other open space is a regional

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

80

1 benefit of enormous value. This is a unique opportunity
2 to provide improvements in the state park that are not
3 likely to be funded in the near or distant future due to
4 the economic woes, loss and budget problems the state is
5 facing.

6 Finally, the alternative to finding a
7 compromise on all of these issues discussed here for the
8 placement of these lines is even more expensive.
9 Expensive items are already bearing their ugly head.
10 Lawsuits are being filed which could tie up this project
11 in courts for years. These lawsuits benefit no one,
12 except maybe the lawyers, and only serve to delay the
13 huge benefit of the Tehachapi Project.

14 Our community asks that you recognize the
15 benefit of the compromise that is represented by the
16 City of Chino Hills alternative plan and support this
17 alternative in your final recommendation.

18 Thank you for time, attention this evening.

19 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

20 STATEMENT OF MR. BURNS

21 MR. BURNS: I've lived in the Chino Hills area for
22 21 years now.

23 I agree with many of the comments made by all
24 of my peers, and friends relatives that live in city.

25 I do have a written statement, but I just want
26 to say that it is important that the PUC take all of the
27 information that you heard here tonight back and
28 seriously consider the impact that this would have on

**E.42-1,
cont.**

E.43-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

81

1 families and community as a whole. There are children
2 here. I've raised my children here.

3 I support this community. I don't live in
4 Chino Hills anymore, I live in Chino now. I moved
5 because I had a better life. But all of my friends are
6 still here. My children play here. My children go to
7 school here. Everything that affects my life is still
8 in Chino Hills.

9 And I just want you to know that these people
10 are concerned for their lives. It is important that you
11 take a really, really hard look at this, listen what
12 they have to say.

13 Thank you.

14 STATEMENT OF MS. SYKES

15 MS. SYKES: Hello, my name is Antoinette Sykes. I
16 apologize. I'm not on the list. I'm cutting.

17 I am a resident of Chino Hills. My home is
18 one of the 1,000 that is within the right-of-way.

19 And when I moved to Chino Hills, I did so like
20 many other residents here because it is a strong family
21 community. It was a safe place to live. I moved here
22 knowing this was the city that I wanted to raise my
23 future family. This is my future family (indicating).
24 This is my little boy. He is going to be named
25 Benjamin. He is due in May. His health is my number
26 one concern. As a future California resident, and your
27 future public, his health should also be your concern.

28 It cannot be disproved that electromagnetics

E.43-1,
cont.

E.44-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

82

1 does not cause childhood leukemia.

2 I don't know if any of you have, but if you
3 have not, please drive the proposed route. Drive to the
4 top of Eucalyptus Street, which is the street I live off
5 of. See where these lines really are going to run.

6 Look at the walking trail that many take every day with
7 your dogs, with your kids. The route that I have walked
8 daily and plan to walk pushing a stroller pretty soon.
9 And ask yourselves if these were in your backyard, if
10 these were your walking trails and your parks and your
11 schools, how comfortable would you be knowing that you
12 can be risking the health of yourself and your children
13 and grandchildren with these proposed lines?

14 There is an alternate route. It is a better
15 route, because if there is a risk to health, then the
16 decision is are -- would you choose to risk the health
17 of coyotes and bobcats or those of yourself, your kids,
18 grandkids and my future son?

19 So I urge you, truly, drive the route. Do it
20 during the day when you can see kids playing in the
21 park. On my way here tonight, at the bottom of Cross
22 Roads Park, which is Chino Hills Parkway. There were 30
23 kids practicing soccer, which is a park that these lines
24 also run through. I urge you to do that. Please, go
25 out and see what is being affected.

26 Thank you.

27 STATEMENT OF MR. BOUWER

28 MR. BOUWER: Hi, my name is Louis Bouwer,

**E.44-1,
cont.**

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

83

1 B-o-u-w-e-r.

2 I can't think of nothing new tonight to say.

3 I'm just going to jump through a few points I wanted to
4 bring up.

5 About 40 years ago I bought my property with a
6 transmission line in my backyard. The representative
7 told me the transmission line has not been active for 30
8 years. So from my personal environmental impact study,
9 I decided my property is safe, and I bought it and I
10 moved in.

11 I'm a mechanical engineer, In my wildness
12 imagination was not prepared for this decision from
13 Edison's engineers and executives to put a 500-kilovolt
14 transmission line in 150 feet wide right-of-way, so is
15 within 55 feet away from my backyard. Are you willing
16 to live 75 feet away from 500-kilovolt transmission
17 line?

E.45-1

18 My second point, to our knowledge this is the
19 only -- this well may be the only 500-kilovolt
20 transmission line with 150 feet right-of-way.

21 Now, where am I going to go to take my wife if
22 she can't work. Where am I going to go if my kids have
23 cancer. This decision definitely has a lot of
24 responsibility with it.

25 My last point, and third point, the City of
26 Chino Hills done a lot of working this project, to work
27 alternative route.

28 I definitely do like Chino Hills State Park.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

84

1 I guess that is why I'm working at the Cal State Marine
2 Lab, I like animals. Definitely I do support the state
3 park, and I understand what they are trying to do. But
4 definitely I need to look after myself and children as
5 well.

6 So I hope you will support alternative.

7 THE REPORTER: Judge, I'm sorry, I need to change
8 my paper.

9 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Let's good off the record and
10 take a break for a few minutes.

11 (Recess taken)

12 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Let's go back on the record.

13 So I have Valerie Wend, Jeff Short, Ross
14 Fernandez.

15 STATEMENT OF MS. WEND

16 MS. WEND: Hi, my name is Valerie Wend, W-e-n-d.

17 I've been a Chino Hills resident for eight
18 years. Actually was a homeowner, I actually did due
19 diligence before I moved into my home. I am adjacent
20 right next to the easement.

21 I did call Edison, and asked them if the lines
22 were active. They told me no, they hadn't been active
23 for 30 years. I asked them repeatedly, so there is no
24 plans for these lines to be active? And their response
25 was yes, there are no plans for them to be active. And
26 then lo and behold, several years later here we are and
27 I am having this discussion with you.

28 As an educator teaching 8 grade students I

**E.45-1,
cont.**

E.46-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

85

1 teach students to do the right thing. And I hope the
2 CPUC would do exactly what we teach our children, to do
3 the right thing.

E.46-1,
cont.

4 I actually teach school right down the street
5 on Morning Field and Payton where there is 400-plus
6 students that are actually at that school. They are
7 also going to be impacted.

E.46-2

8 So I leave you with one last statement: The
9 Parks Commission, I heard someone comment, they said the
10 ultimate question should be what is best for the land.
11 But I say to you that is not the question. The ultimate
12 question is what is best for the people. That is what
13 you need to be thanking about.

E.46-3

14 Thank you for your time.

15 STATEMENT OF MR. SHORT

16 MR. SHORT: Good evening.

17 Jeff Short, S-h-o-r-t.

18 I do not enjoy public speaking, but I'm here
19 tonight with a heart full of love for God, children,
20 community and nature.

21 The Draft EIR fails to consider the City of
22 Chino Hills' generous and extensive mitigation plan
23 attached to the proposed Route 4C. The City proposes a
24 restoration plan along Route 4C that includes the
25 planning of oak, woodland, cottonwood willow, scrub
26 species, and native grass species within the state park.
27 The restoration of these plant species in areas adjacent
28 to granite areas and high quality streams would support

E.47-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

86

1 and enhance wildlife.

**E.47-1,
cont.**

2 The Draft EIR addresses streambeds as if they
3 are unique only in the state park. Along the Southern
4 California Edison preferred route and adjacent to many
5 of our homes flows a streambed that is a habitat to the
6 same wildlife and plant species found in the state park.
7 How is our streambed not adversely impacted by Edison as
8 preferred route?

E.47-2

9 This city is an extension of the state park.
10 Does Edison propose any mitigation or restoration to our
11 lives and the habitats adversely affected by their
12 preferred route? They do not and cannot restore these
13 losses to us. We cannot sell our homes, we cannot move.

14 I challenge the CPUC to name another city
15 along Edison's route that proposes supplemental planting
16 of native scrub species and native grass species that
17 the City's Route 4C provides. This mitigation plan will
18 fund project monitoring and operational costs associated
19 with restoring the state park along Route 4C for 10
20 years.

E.47-3

21 Don't break my heart or the heart of the city.
22 Route 4C is a superior alternative route.

23 Thank you.

24 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Ross Fernandes, I understand
25 Mr. Fernandes has a couple of slides that will be up
26 here.

27 And you are going to really keep to three
28 minutes?

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

87

1 STATEMENT OF MR. FERNANDES

2 MR. FERNANDES: Yes, I am.

3 Thank you Commissioners, Melissa for operating
4 the machine, my high IQ community here.

5 What we need to focus on is the fact that this
6 is statewide systems project. And we are in favor of
7 the entire TRTP except for the H8A segment.

8 You've -- if you could give me the nonword
9 slides, please.

E.48-1

10 Okay, the key reasons that we object to
11 Segment H8A is that we are talking about an
12 unprecedented installation of a 500 kV circuit through a
13 highly condensed residential area.

14 What we are worried about is the fact that
15 200 feet towers -- can we slow down that -- we have
16 200 feet towers that will be situated in a seismic zone.
17 And couple that with the fact that you've got very high
18 canyon winds that get to routinely 75 and 80 miles an
19 hour, this was the 1999 Hector Mines quake, you see what
20 happened to the towers there.

E.48-2

21 The 1994 Northridge Quake, I was an Edison
22 employee in the R&D department for 15-1/2 years. And
23 with Carl Todd, I saw the effects of the 1994 North
24 Ridge Quake on the Pardee Substation, on the Moorpark
25 Substation. Towers that were huge and well built
26 collapsed. And it really concerns me as a technical
27 person in R&D.

28 That -- this community has done a great job of

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

88

1 in fact optimizing the route with the information
2 they've gathered. What we need to know or understand is
3 that this is not just a deadline of dead circuit
4 project, it is going to be ultimately involved in the
5 control of the California grid with green megawatts.

**E.48-2,
cont.**

6 And I'm suggesting that we look into the
7 system benefits of having the state park -- the state
8 park route, which allows us to put a switching station
9 within the existing right-of-way. And if we could put
10 the switching station right there within the existing
11 right-of-way to consolidate the existing circuits, we
12 could have a net reduction in the number of 500 kV
13 circuit miles, consequently a reduction in the
14 environmental impact.

15 Most important, we are talking about with a
16 station in the path of consolidating circuits, you are
17 going to be able to control the grid and transfer green
18 megawatts far more efficiently.

E.48-3

19 The R&D of Edison -- I love to take lemons and
20 turn him into lemonade. One of the things we can do
21 with all the brain power that has been focused on this
22 alternative path is that we could improve the control of
23 the entire State of California grid with a strategic
24 implementation of all the smart grid concepts that are
25 close to implementation. And those can be done in a
26 step, in a well-planned fashion in this compact
27 substation within the state park.

28 Without affecting the -- if you look at this,

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

89

1 and I walked through this state park. And look at that
2 squirrel there.

3 (Laughter)

4 MR. FERNANDES: He enjoys the existing habitat.
5 He is happy.

6 And if we consolidated these circuits that are
7 already there, he is going to say, well, gees you are
8 going to have kid safety, park enhancement, shorter 500
9 kV lines, lower maintenance cost. Access here is going
10 to be far better than trying to get access in a highly
11 crowded residential area.

12 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Your time is up, I'm afraid.

13 MR. FERNANDES: Just a few more.

14 These are the circuits we are trying to
15 consolidate, and this is all the existing stuff. And
16 what I'm talking about is if we combine and
17 strategically locate at the compressed gas station, at
18 the state park within the right-of-way pretty much, then
19 we will effectively use the grid and save 10 trillion
20 BTUs of fossil fuel every year through better control.
21 And all your economics are going to go out the window if
22 they do this properly.

23 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you very much.

24 You said you had a hard copy of that, so we
25 have it in the transcript as well.

26 Keith Cerwinski, Neil Connolly, Joanne Genis.

27 We are near the finish line.

28 STATEMENT OF MS. GENIS

E.48-3,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

90

1 MS. GENIS: I'm Joanne Genis. I know it is kind
2 of getting late. If they want to come and tap my
3 shoulder, I'll let them in.

4 Joanne Genis, G like in George, e-n-i-s,
5 member of one of the CARE groups. I live on Garden
6 Court in the beautiful City of Chino Hills, which I want
7 it to stay beautiful.

8 My home is approximately 100-foot from the
9 edge of the proposed route. There are only two access
10 roads that lead into my street. And if SCE route is
11 chosen, both these streets will have lines above them.
12 Can we avoid them? No. You might say we will be
13 trapped.

14 I am in favor of green energy, but not when it
15 goes through the heart of my city, affects the quality
16 of life for many residents and put many in harms way.
17 This project is not safe for our city.

18 Our easement area is 100 feet and 198 poles
19 for 500 kV transmission line, the only place the DEIR
20 and PEA shows that the right-of-way is a small 150 feet
21 here in this short stretch of the project. According to
22 SCE guidelines, this phase of the towers will need a
23 clearance of 100 feet. This is not possible in this
24 right-of-way, only 75-foot masses.

25 A properly sized right-of-way means this
26 project must be changed. You have two choices: Route
27 the line elsewhere along one of the four alternatives
28 the city has proposed, or condemn houses on either side

E.49-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

91

1 of the right-of-way and remove them so they have an
2 excessive -- larger and safer right-of-way. Do we in
3 the community want to be thrown out of our homes by
4 eminent domain and forced to find new housing in this
5 economic climate? Absolutely not.

E.49-1,
cont.

6 Please, we need to find another alternate.
7 Alternate Route C and the mitigations that the City has
8 proposed would be a win-win solution for all.

E.49-2

9 I was disturbed to read in the DEIR under
10 Section 4 under significant and unavoidable
11 environmental impacts that the air quality would exceed
12 thresholds during the construction and that the noise
13 level would violate local standards. What about the
14 nightshift workers who sleep during the day, like my
15 neighbor? What about my neighbor who has COPD and walks
16 everyday with an oxygen tank? What about my neighbors'
17 son who has asthma when so much construction is taking
18 place? Now, you tell me, how can that be fair?

E.49-3

19 I have so much more to say, but with a
20 three-minute limit, it can't be done. So I will be
21 sending my additional comments via e-mail.

22 I understand the project needs to be approved
23 and soon. It should not be about the faster and
24 cheapest way, it needs be about the most safest and most
25 logical way.

E.49-4

26 We need to protect them and him (indicating)
27 who has COPD. These are the kids that stand under the
28 bus stop everyday. There are a total of three buses and

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

92

1 eight stops. This kid has asthma, this one has learning
2 disabilities. He needs a quiet place to do his
3 homework. With this construction, where am I going to
4 put him? This is my son. We need -- this is our
5 future. These are our kids, our future, and senior
6 citizens. This is what we need to make this project
7 about.

8 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Andrew Teater, then Neal
9 Connolly.

10 STATEMENT OF MR. CONNOLLY

11 MR. CONNOLLY: Neil Connolly, C-o double n double
12 l-y. I'm the President of the Chino Hills State Park
13 Interpretative Association.

14 Our mission is to enhance public awareness in
15 the importance of maintaining and restoring the unique
16 natural habitat within the Chino Hills State Park. And
17 we do that through interpretative, educational
18 activities. We have lots of school kids in there,
19 college people. We take them around, tell them about
20 the wonderful park we have.

21 The Department of Parks & Recreation's mission
22 is to provide for the health and inspiration education
23 of the people of California by helping to preserve the
24 state's extraordinary biological diversity, protecting
25 its most valued habitat and cultural resources in
26 creating opportunities for high-quality outdoor
27 recreation.

28 Because of the efforts for Hills For Everyone,

**E.49-4,
cont.**

E.50-1

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

93

1 our state Legislatures -- Chino Hills State Park is not
2 an international airport, it is not a cemetery, it is
3 not filled with thousands of houses and is not a
4 landfill. It is a state park.

5 The Interpretative Association does not
6 believe that urban infrastructure uses like power lines
7 meets the park's mission. That said, we also recognize
8 what the impacts of this project and this segment have
9 on the residents of the outlying communities. Excuse
10 me, I had a printer malfunction here.

11 In order to properly analyze the impact
12 alternatives that reroute lines through the parks, we
13 believe the draft impact -- Draft Environmental Impact
14 Report needs to be recirculated, because there are no
15 side-by-side comparisons in the alternatives. Should
16 the alternative be selected that reroutes the power
17 lines through the park, the mitigation package that will
18 offset the negative impact should be comprehensive in
19 nature and provide the park with net environmental
20 benefit.

21 We support the position of the Hills For
22 Everyone, and look forward to reviewing a more complete
23 analysis of the impacts of the park and revise the EIR.

24 Thank you.

25 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: We don't have Keith Cerwinski.

26 I have three more names here. We have Jackie
27 Ayer representing herself, Andrea Gullo and Sara
28 Feldman.

E.50-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

94

1 STATEMENT OF MS. AYER

2 MS. AYER: Yes, my name is Jacqueline Ayer. I
3 live in Acton. I'm perhaps the only interloper here. I
4 am here to speak on behalf of the community of Acton.

5 Contrary to what the EIR indicates, Vincent
6 Station, many of the lines of this project are actually
7 in Acton, not near Acton. And much of all of Acton is
8 actually -- is not open space as the EIR indicates. It
9 actually is zoned for residential primarily and some
10 agricultural use.

E.51-1

11 The Tehachapi Project is intended to provide
12 Edison with access of up to 500 megawatts of wind power.
13 As of today, however, the Cal ISO Generator Connection
14 queue doesn't even identify 4,000 megawatts of power
15 flowing from wind generator sources to Edison. So I'm
16 not actually sure why we are here.

17 There are proposed hybrid natural gas
18 combustion in solar in the system that are identified in
19 the queue, but Antelope Valley residents are not
20 confident these projects are legitimately green. We are
21 concerned that they will primarily be used as natural
22 gas combustion. So Acton is concerned the Tehachapi
23 Project not will actually be used to transmit the green
24 power that Edison promises.

E.51-2

25 The Tehachapi Project shares many similarities
26 with the Sunrise Project. In Sunrise, both the EIR and
27 staff recommended the no project alternative by
28 determining that San Diego could meet its RPS goals with

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

95

1 wind generation. Yet, inexplicably, this alternative is
2 given barely a glance in the Draft EIR document. The
3 community of Acton would like to understand why any
4 future generation is actually possible in San Diego but
5 it is not possible in the LA Basin.

6 The reconnecting alternative was rejected by
7 the Draft EIR with virtually no analysis. It was
8 rejected for reasons that are inconsistent with data
9 that was presented at a CPUC workshop held just two
10 months ago. This is a slide from that presentation.

11 Contrary to what the Draft EIR reports, ACCC
12 and ACCR conductors will double the megawatt capacity
13 and not just get 50 percent increase as reported. It
14 can be done without new towers.

15 Acton urges the Commission to not reject the
16 reconductoring alternative. This project will replace
17 70-foot towers with 200-foot towers on three
18 transmission lines in Acton south of (inaudible). In
19 this area fires are fought, construction is saved
20 primarily via aerial drops. It is certain that Acton
21 residents will not be protected as they are now if this
22 project proceeds.

23 A key at issue in establishing the need for
24 Segments 5, 6, 9, 11, actually all of the segments, is
25 to determine the current line capacity of the existing
26 configuration. It is also important to understand the
27 conditions under which these lines will be switched from
28 220 kV to 500 kV. Unfortunately, the Draft EIR does not

E.51-2,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

96

1 address these issues, and staff can't provide the
2 information. I was at the show, the show, workshop last
3 night, and that information is not available.

4 Acton urges the Commission to relook at the
5 baseline conditions that we have now such as several
6 lines remaining in the Chino Hills area and other areas.
7 Anyway, really look at the baseline conditions we have
8 now before deciding whether or not to make the drastic
9 changes that this project entails.

**E.51-2,
cont.**

10 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

11 MS. AYER: Thank you for your time.

12 Andrea Gullo, Sara Feldman.

13 STATEMENT OF MS. GULLO

14 MS. GULLO: Good evening, Madam Chairman, and
15 members of the Commission.

16 My name is Andrea Gullo, spelled G-u-l-l-o.

17 I'm the Executive Director of the Puente Hills
18 Landfill Native Habitat Preservation Authority, and we
19 are a public preservation agency. We have a board of
20 directors made up of the City of Whittier, County of Los
21 Angeles, the Sanitation District in LA County, and we
22 additionally appointed a Hacienda Heights Improvement
23 Association.

E.52-1

24 We manage almost 4,000 acres. We manage these
25 lands in part for biological and recreation value. We
26 are the western anchor for the Puente-Chino Hills
27 Corridor as previously mentioned.

28 And I support the comments previously made by

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

97

1 La Habra Heights councilmembers and resident Stephen
2 Blagden and Dave Cowardin.

3 The Draft EIR is lacking in several areas, as
4 Mr. Blagden and Mr. Cowardin mentioned. And the Habitat
5 Authority, we will be -- we will be submitting detailed
6 comments, because we have very serious concerns on
7 several different levels.

E.52-1,
cont.

8 Basically, the project violates our resource
9 management plan for the preserve. The project is
10 contrary to our biological, visual, recreational goals
11 and policies. And we consider these very significant
12 impacts.

13 Also, particular significant impacts are the
14 new routes through the preserve in not one, not two, but
15 three locations. And we consider these unacceptable,
16 because there virtually were no reasonable or adequate
17 alternatives submitted.

18 The bottom line is the result from this
19 project will have significant impacts to permanent
20 habitat loss, areas that were once protected will not be
21 as a result of this. There will be significant impacts
22 of fragmentation, and also significant impacts caused by
23 noise, and impacts to recreation and very significant
24 impacts to aesthetics.

E.52-2

25 I want to point out that the project will
26 adversely impact almost all of our 25 miles of trails.
27 And there are virtually no additional simulations that
28 were provided in the document, as we requested.

E.52-3

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

98

1 All of these impacts need to be mitigated so
2 that will be a net environmental benefit to the
3 preserve.

E.52-3,
cont.

4 We have invested many tens of millions of
5 dollars into the preserve, public dollars into the
6 preserve for acquisition, restoration and management.
7 This project will be jeopardizing that public
8 investment.

E.52-4

9 Thank you.

10 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: I have a Sara Feldman.

11 STATEMENT OF MS. FELDMAN

12 MS. FELDMAN: Good evening.

13 I'm the last speaker, so I'll try to finish
14 with a bang here.

15 My name is Sara Feldman, F-e-l-d-m-a-n. I'm
16 the Vice President of California State Parks Foundation.
17 The foundation is a nonprofit partner of state parks.
18 It is our mission to protect, enhance and advocate for
19 California State Parks.

E.53-1

20 The foundation has successfully fought to
21 preserve state parks throughout Southern California, and
22 in recent years including the toll road through Santa
23 Ana State Beach and the Sunrise Powerlink Project
24 through Anza-Borrego Desert State Park.

25 Those fights were based on the principle that
26 state parks are not holding areas for infrastructure and
27 development, they are public lands. They are held for
28 the public benefit in perpetuity. That is the absolute

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

99

1 meaning of a state park, "in perpetuity."

2 We recognize and we appreciate the concerns,
3 all of the concerns stressed by the people here tonight.
4 But we are also deeply concerned about Chino Hills State
5 Park, which is a valuable, precious resource for all of
6 the communities surrounding it and the entire state.

7 Therefore, the foundation will be submitting
8 comments on the Draft EIR, and we will be following this
9 matter closely as will our 100,000 members statewide.

10 Thank you.

11 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: Thank you.

12 First of all, I want to thank you for your
13 participation today, for your comments.

14 I know it has been a long night. I see that
15 many people stayed through to the end.

16 I also want to explain one or two things about
17 our process. We've been talking a lot about the
18 environmental review process. But in order for any
19 transmission project like this to be approved, the
20 Commission has to issue a certificate of public
21 convenience and necessity, which considers not just the
22 environmental factors, but other factors as well.

23 A number of -- the City of Chino Hills is a
24 party in this proceeding, and we will be having
25 testimony and then will be having evidentiary hearings
26 in May that will cross-examine that testimony. And I
27 know that you are well represented by counsel.

28 And -- but if you are from an area that is not

E.53-1,
cont.

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

100

1 Chino Hills that is interested in what is going on, you
2 may want to make sure that you are following what is
3 going on in the formal proceeding, and not just what is
4 going on in the environmental review, to make sure that
5 you preserve your rights.

6 I want you to know that we take all of this
7 very seriously. And the feasibility -- ultimately we
8 have to determine whether or not there -- whether or not
9 the project is feasible, whether it is environmentally
10 reasonable, whether things can be mitigated to the
11 extent that they can, and that the project is going to
12 be done in the interest of the public. So we are taking
13 this evidence very, very seriously.

14 The Commission, after we get the Final
15 Environmental Impact Report, FEIS, will review it. I
16 will, as the Administrative Law Judge, draft a proposed
17 decision which will be presented to the Commissioners.
18 And the Commissioners will, based upon the record, the
19 environmental documents and the things that come up in
20 the testimony and in the hearings, will consider all of
21 these factors, and will either adopt my proposed
22 decision or they will propose an alternative of their
23 own. And then they will vote, because they are the
24 people who were appointed by the Governor to represent
25 the people of the State of California.

26 So my anticipation is that we will see
27 something no earlier than late this summer. But we have
28 a draft scoping memo to be issued earlier this week. If

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

101

1 you want to know what that means, you should either look
2 at it on the CPUC website, or speak to an attorney or
3 somebody else knowledgeable about the CPUC stuff who can
4 explain all what I'm talking about here. Or if you have
5 any procedural questions, we are happy to answer
6 procedural questions regarding our process. We are
7 trying to make this a process that is open, that is
8 transparent as possible. And we take your input
9 extremely seriously.

10 Thank you very much for the City of Chino
11 Hills for hosting us, and for the hospitality you've
12 shown. I want you to know we have, the best that we
13 can, reviewed your lovely city and the proposed route.
14 And we will be taking this all very seriously in
15 consideration.

16 With that, I'm going to -- is there any
17 comment from anybody else?

18 COMMISSIONER GRUENEICH: Yes.

19 Again, I wanted to thank everybody for taking
20 the time tonight. I've learned a great deal tonight and
21 certainly will be sharing that with my fellow
22 Commissioners.

23 ALJ KOLAKOWSKI: I want you to know that just
24 because the Commissioners who were not here are all
25 represented by their able technical and legal staff, who
26 they rely upon very much on matters like this, who will
27 be fully briefing them.

28 They will also have available to them the

Comment Set E.5 through E.53, continued: Public Meeting Transcript, March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

102

1 transcript of today's public participation hearing, as
2 well as all the record in the proceeding.

3 So thank you very much. I will call today's
4 public participation hearing to a close.

5 We are adjourned.

6 (Whereupon, at the hour of 9:25 p.m.,
7 this Public Participation Hearing
adjourned.)

8 * * * * *

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Response to Comment Set E.5 through E.53: Public Meeting Transcript March 19, 2009, Chino Hills, CA

- E.5-1 Thank you for your comments. Please see General Responses GR-8 and GR-10.
- E.5-2 Thank you for your comment supporting the alternative proposed by the City of Chino Hills. The CPUC, Forest Service, SCE, City of Chino Hills, and California Department of Parks and Recreation have worked together during the Draft EIR/EIS process to identify issues and alternatives, and to analyze the impacts of alternatives. No decisions have been made by the federal decision-makers to approve any alternative and no recommendations have been made in the Draft EIR/EIS for approval of any alternative.
- E.5-3 Thank you for your comment.
- E.5-4 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding tower failure.
- E.6-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-8 (Use of 150-Foot-Wide ROW for a 500-kV Transmission Line).
- E.6-2 Thank you for your comment.
- E.6-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns. Please see General Response GR-10.
- E.7-1 Thank you for your comment.
- E.7-2 Thank you for expressing your opinion. The adverse visual impacts of the proposed Project are discussed in detail in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Please see General Responses GR-2, GR-5, GR-6, and GR-10 regarding electric and magnetic fields, property values, property acquisition, and tower failure.
- E.8-1 No decision has yet been made to approve SCE's proposed Project or any other alternative. However, the proposed Project and alternatives have been defined and analyzed, which makes it possible to make determinations as to whether or not property needs to be acquired for their implementation, if approved. The proposed Project evaluated in the Draft EIR/EIS (Alternative 2) does not involve the condemnation of any property. Please see General Response GR-6 regarding property acquisition.
- E.8-2 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-8 (Use of 150-Foot-Wide ROW for a 500-kV Transmission Line).
- E.8-3 The No Further Action status related to the Solid Waste Management Units was issued by the DTSC in September 2008. The letter by the RWQCB referenced in the comment (DTSC to Mr. Doug LaBelle, City Manager, City of Chino Hills, November 21, 2008) specifically states that they are not issuing a determination of "no further action" for the proposed Route C transmission line corridor.
- Alternative 4 would occur entirely off federal lands; therefore the detailed description of Alternative 4 has not been reproduced in the Final EIS. However, the Forest Service is aware of your comment. Please note that revisions were incorporated in the Final EIR prepared by the CPUC.

- E.9-1 Thank you for expressing your opinion regarding the proposed Project and alternative routes. It is noted that you support Alternative 4. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.10-1 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project. Effects on the quality of life are discussed in Section 3.12 of the Draft EIR/EIS and can be taken into consideration by federal decision-makers in deciding whether or not to approve any of the project alternatives. For a discussion of eminent domain, please see General Response GR-6. No decisions have been made by federal decision-makers to approve any alternative and no recommendations have been made in the Draft EIR/EIS for approval of any alternative.
- E.10-2 The City of Chino Hills is located within Segment 8 of the proposed Project (Alternative 2). As discussed in Draft EIR/EIS Table 3.10-3 (Existing Audible Corona Noise along Proposed Project Route) and Draft EIR/EIS page 3.10-8, Corona Noise Locations 3 and 6 from Table 3.10-3 represent existing transmission line corona noise along this segment. Draft EIR/EIS Impact N-3 (Permanent noise levels along the ROW would increase due to corona noise from operation of the transmission lines and substations) analyzed the proposed Project increase in corona noise over existing ambient conditions, which as described above included existing transmission line corona noise.
- Please see Section 3.10.4.3 (Impact Assessment Methodology) of the Draft EIR/EIS for a complete description of how noise impacts were evaluated.
- E.10-3 Thank you for your comment.
- E.11-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see the response to Comment A.23-102 regarding the general plan.
- E.11-2 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.11-3 Please see the response to Comment A.23-102.
- E.12-1 Comments regarding the General Plan pertain to the CPUC and do not relate to the EIS. However, the Forest Service is aware of your comments. Please note that a complete response was provided in the Final EIR produced by the CPUC.
- Section 3.14 (Visual Resources) of the Draft EIR/EIS addresses effects of the Project on scenic views; Project effects on wildlife habitats and corridors are described in Section 3.4 (Biological Resources) of the Draft EIR/EIS; natural drainage courses are addressed in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR/EIS; and finally, recreational resources including trail systems, equestrian opportunities, bicycling, and hiking are addressed in Section 3.15 (Wilderness and Recreation) of the Draft EIR/EIS. Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding the Project; all comments will be shared with federal decision-makers and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.
- E.12-2 The commenter is correct in noting that a number of recreational resources, including multi-use trails for cycling and horseback riding, are available in Powder Canyon and the surrounding area. Section 3.15 (Wilderness and Recreation) of the Draft EIR/EIS describes

- recreational resources and opportunities available in the Powder Canyon area. Section 3.15 also discusses impacts of the Project that would affect these recreational resources, and introduces mitigation measures to reduce the significance of Project impacts. Visual impacts of the Project are described in Section 3.14 (Visual Resources) of the Draft EIR/EIS, and noise impacts are addressed in Section 3.10 (Noise) of the Draft EIR/EIS. The analysis provided in Section 3 acknowledges that some impacts of the Project, including those related to aesthetics and noise, would be adverse and unavoidable, even with implementation of mitigation measures. Additionally, please see the response to Comment E.12-1 for a discussion of General Plan consistency, specifically as related to La Habra Heights.
- E.13-1 The commenter addresses several unique points with regard to the Fire Prevention and Suppression section of the Draft EIR/EIS (Section 3.16): (a) that the Draft EIR/EIS does not prioritize values at risk, that it should prioritize life safety over property safety, and that it places too little emphasis on life safety; (b) that the proposed Project would place a new transmission line in a corridor that already provides too little clearance for firefighting; and (c) that the Draft EIR/EIS doesn't adequately consider the benefits of Alternative 4 with regard to this alternative's removal of existing transmission lines in comparison to the proposed Project. To address point "a", the Draft EIR/EIS considers all values at risk, and there is no need to prioritize these values. The Draft EIR/EIS poses mitigation measures to protect both life and property from wildfires caused by or exacerbated by the proposed Project or alternatives. The federal decision-makers acknowledge that it is incumbent upon a fire chief to prioritize life over property during a wildfire: ensuring evacuation of residential areas and ensuring the safety of firefighting personnel during residential protection operations. However, no such ranking of priorities is necessary in the Draft EIR/EIS to achieve the objectives of disclosing impacts of the project and mitigating those impacts to the extent feasible. To address point "b", rather than adding another transmission line to an existing corridor where Segment 8 passes through residential areas in the City of Chino Hills, the proposed Project would merely replace an existing transmission line. No additional ROW would be required. Therefore, the proposed Project would not increase firefighting impacts above the baseline conditions. Please see the response to Comment A.23-20 for additional detail. To address point "c" please see the response to Comment A.23-20.
- E.14-1 Thank you for your comment.
- E.14-2 Thank you for your comment.
- E.15-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.16-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding potential tower failure.
- E.16-2 Thank you for your comment. The federal decision-makers appreciate the efforts of the City of Chino Hills in helping formulate a reasonable range of alternatives for analysis in the Draft EIR/EIS.
- E.17-1 Thank you for your comment and for expressing your opinion. For clarification, SCE's proposed Project (Alternative 2) does not involve the acquisition of any residential property

and no additional ROW needs to be acquired in the City of Chino Hills. Please see General Response GR-6 regarding property acquisition.

- E.18-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.18-2 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.18-3 As discussed in Section 5.2, the affected environment described in the Draft EIR/EIS generally consists of conditions that existed at the time the Notice of Intent for the Draft EIR/EIS were published. This is in accordance with NEPA requirements.
- E.18-4 Thank you for your comment. Alternate Route C would have fewer impacts on noise, traffic, socioeconomics, and electrical interference. However, air quality impacts would be similar to the proposed Project and Alternative 4C would place Project elements, specifically new transmission structures, switching station, and access/spur roads, on the Aerojet property that is a known munitions testing and disposal site currently undergoing cleanup through DTSC.
- Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers reviewing the document.
- E.18-5 Thank you for sharing you and your son's health condition as well as your opinions on the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the document.
- E.18-6 Thank you for your comment.
- E.18-7 Thank you for your comment. Please see Section 3.10 of the Draft EIR/EIS for more information on the Project's noise impacts. Also, please see Section 3.17 for a discussion of possible interference with electronic medical devices.
- E.18-8 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.19-1 Thank you for your comments. Alternatives suggested during scoping were addressed in the Alternatives Screening Report located in Appendix A of the Draft EIR/EIS. Alternatives considered included the use/expansion of existing corridors, as well as consideration of a new corridor through the Cajon Pass. Please also see General Response GR-1 regarding the alternatives identification, screening, and analysis process.

The locations where SCE has identified the use of tubular steel poles for the proposed Project (Alternative 2) are discussed in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS in the "Routing Details" of each segment and are shown in cross-section figures (Figures 2.2-2 through 2.2-63) and identified in the Map & Figures Series Volume (Part 6, Project Segment Detail Maps). Conductor types are also identified for each segment within Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR/EIS under "Engineering Details". Mitigation measures are clearly defined for each issue area in Sections 3.2 through 3.17 of the Final EIS.

It is recommended that the City of La Habra Heights continue to coordinate with SCE for the visual simulations previously requested from SCE.

As described in Section 2.2.9.1, within Segment 8A, 500-kV double-circuit structures are proposed. The conductors would be in a split-phased configuration, which is where double-circuit construction is used to carry the load of a single circuit in order to phase the circuit for electric field cancellation. As such, there would not be an empty circuit available to place a 220-kV circuit onto the new structures.

E.19-2 Thank you for your comment.

E.19-3 Recognizing that there is a great deal of public interest regarding EMF from power lines, the Draft EIR/EIS included information regarding EMF. This information is relevant both inside the right-of-way and outside the right-of-way and included the nature of electric and magnetic fields, summaries of applicable regulation and information from studies and scientific panel reviews. The Draft EIR/EIS noted that there is no consensus in the scientific community regarding health risks associated with EMF exposure and, therefore, conclusions regarding this concern cannot be reached. Information related to field reduction measures was also included as well as modeling of magnetic fields at the edge of the transmission line right-of-way. The edge of the right-of-way was utilized as a reference point as this is the demarcation between public areas and the area utilized by the utility for the transmission facility.

E.20-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. These will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project. The CPUC, Forest Service, SCE, City of Chino Hills, and California Department of Parks and Recreation have worked together during the Draft EIR/EIS process to identify issues and alternatives, and to analyze the impacts of alternatives. No decisions have been made by the federal decision-makers to approve any alternative and no recommendations have been made in the Draft EIR/EIS for approval of any alternative.

In response to the commenter's concern that the public hearing is unnecessary, we offer the following for clarification. In accordance with CEQA and NEPA requirements, an EIR/EIS must be completed before a decision to approve or deny the project can be made by the Lead Agencies. The EIR/EIS must provide the following information: disclosure of the Project's expected impacts on the environment; recommended measures to reduce or avoid adverse impacts; and analysis of a reasonable range of feasible alternatives. The purpose of this process is to inform the public about the impacts of the Project and to provide agency decision-makers with vital Project information to aid in their decisions regarding Project approval. When the Draft EIR/EIS has been completed, it is distributed for public review and comment in accordance with the requirements of both CEQA (CEQA Guidelines §15087) and NEPA (NEPA Regulations 40 CFR 1506.6). During the 45-day comment period following publication of the Draft EIR/EIS a public hearing may be conducted to obtain public comment on environmental issues addressed in the Draft EIR/EIS. Although a public hearing is not mandatory, lead agencies often include public hearings as a way to effectively meet public participation requirements.

E.21-1 Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns regarding the Project. The Puente Hills Landfill Native Habitat Preserve is described in Section 3.15 (Wilderness and Recreation) of the Draft EIR/EIS, including a discussion of how Project impacts would affect areas under jurisdiction of the Habitat Authority. The Draft EIR/EIS acknowledges that the Project would result in construction- and operation/maintenance-related impacts to this area.

In addition, please see General Response GR-1 (Alternatives Identification, Screening, and Analysis) for a discussion of how Project alternatives were identified and analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. All comments will be shared with federal decision-makers, and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.

- E.22-1 Thank you for your comment. Your support of Alternative Route C is noted. Please note that the Draft EIR/EIS does not make a recommendation for approval of the proposed Project or any alternative.
- E.22-2 Please see General Response GR-9 (Contribution of Funds as Mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act). Mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce the Project impacts to the maximum extent feasible are presented and discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding the Project; all comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers, and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.
- E.22-3 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Please see the response to Comment A.23-15 and General Response GR-9 regarding Chino Hills' proposed Mitigation and Cost Recovery Plan.
- E.23-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.24-1 Please see General Response GR-8 (Use of 150-Foot-Wide ROW for a 500-kV Transmission Line) for a discussion of the proposed Project's ROW width. Thank you for providing your comments and concerns regarding the Project; all comments will be shared with federal decision-makers, and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.
- E.24-2 Thank you for expressing your concerns. Please see General Response GR-10.
- E.25-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Responses GR-2 and GR-10 regarding electric and magnetic fields, and tower failure. Also, please see GR-8 regarding the use of 150-foot-wide right of way (ROW) in Segment 8A.
- E.26-1 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Please see the response to Comment A.23-15 and General Response GR-9 regarding Chino Hills' proposed Mitigation and Cost Recovery Plan.
- E.26-2 Thank you for your comment. Please see the responses to Comments A.23-9, A.23-12, and A.23-15.
- E.26-3 As stated in Section 5.3.4.2 of the Draft EIR/EIS, removal of transmission infrastructure is generally considered an enhancement to the visual quality of an area and, in this case, it would improve visual quality for CHSP users and some Chino Hills residents, resulting in a long-term beneficial effect.

The proposed viewshed enhancement must be linked to an impact. Before mitigation can be formulated, an adverse project impact requiring mitigation must be identified. After a specific adverse impact has been identified that would be caused by the proposed Project, mitigation measures addressing that impact can be developed. Please see the response to Comment A.23-15.

- E.27-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-6 regarding property acquisition.
- E.28-1 Thank you for your comment.
- E.28-2 Thank you for your comment.
- E.28-3 Thank you for your comment.
- E.29-1 Thank you for your comment.
- E.29-2 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Please see the response to Comment A.23-15 and General Response GR-9 regarding Chino Hills' proposed Mitigation and Cost Recovery Plan.
- E.30-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-5 and GR-10 regarding property values and tower failure.
- E.30-2 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Responses GR-2 and GR-10 regarding electric and magnetic fields, and tower failure.
- E.31-1 Thank you for your comments. They will be shared with the federal decision-makers reviewing the Project.

Under SCE's Easement Policy (Rev. 1, July 7, 2008), it is stated that "Buildings and other permanent structures, both above ground and underground are prohibited within SCE's ROW's. Examples of permanent structures are pipelines, concrete slabs [i.e., parking lot], foundations, vaults, decks, detention basins, pools, and anything else that is not portable and easily moveable." In SCE's Secondary Land Use Policy, it states that SCE "will permit secondary uses of its transmission rights-of-way only when these secondary land uses do not conflict with current or projected first priority use, as determined by the company's Transmission and Distribution Business Unit (TDBU). Such uses will be low intensity in nature.... Other possible low-intensity projects include short-term or overflow parking lots or equestrian stables. Since these are not the preferred uses, SCE will not actively pursue these uses but will consider them on a case-by-case basis." Previously existing land uses, such as parking lots, that may conflict with SCE's Secondary Land Use Policy and Transmission Line Right of Way Requirements will be reviewed by SCE on a case-by-case basis. It should be noted that SCE is currently working towards a system-wide policy regarding land uses under 500-kV T/Ls; however, this policy is yet in place.

Please see General Response GR-8 regarding use of the existing 150-foot ROW through Chino Hills. Please note that no expansion of the ROW through Chino Hills is required under SCE's proposed Project (Alternative 2). Please also see General Response GR-10 regarding the potential failure of transmission structures.

- E.31-2 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding tower failure.
- E.31-3 Thank you for your comment. Project costs are not an appropriate topic for the Draft EIR/EIS, but will be considered by federal decision-makers.
- E.31-4 Thank you for expressing your opinion regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.32-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns. Please see Section 3.17 of the Draft EIR/EIS, which discusses the potential for electric and magnetic fields from the transmission line to

disrupt electronic devices, including medical devices. Although the Draft EIR/EIS concludes that such effects are either not adverse or can be readily mitigated, it is recommended that you consult with your wife's doctor regarding potential effects of the transmission line on the electronic devices she requires to manage her medical condition

E.33-1 Thank you for your comment.

E.33-2 Thank you for expressing your opinion regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.

E.34-1 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Please see the response to Comment A.23-15 and General Response GR-9 regarding Chino Hills' proposed Mitigation and Cost Recovery Plan.

E.34-2 Thank you for your comment. Although it is not clear what "piece of paper" is being referenced in Comment E.34-2, it is believed that the piece of paper cited is a listing of schools within one-half mile of the proposed Project ROW that was compiled for the Draft EIR/EIS public workshops. In this listing, the Gerald F. Litel Elementary School and Ayala High School are noted as two schools within one-half mile of proposed Segment 8A in Chino Hills. Although the Chino Valley Community Church is not found within this listing, the list does include the Loving Savior of the Hills in Chino Hills and the Victory Baptist Church in Chino because these facilities contain operational day schools. Nonetheless, if the Church of Jesus Christ Latter Day Saints ("LDS Church") and the catholic church noted in Comment E.34-2 contain operational day schools or daycare facilities, then Mitigation Measures N-1a (Implement Best Management Practices for construction noise [for sensitive receptors]) and N-1b (Avoid sensitive receptors during mobile construction equipment use), as addressed in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.10 (Noise) would apply to minimize potential impacts. Additionally Mitigation Measures L-1a (Construction liaison - Property owners), L-1b (Advance notification of construction - Property owners), L-1c (Quarterly construction updates - Property owners), and L-2a (Construction plan provisions - Non-residential property owners), as addressed in Draft EIR/EIS Section 3.9 (Land Use) would apply regardless of whether these churches contain operational day schools or daycare facilities, as would applicable mitigation measures outlined in Draft EIR/EIS Sections 3.3 (Air Quality) and 3.14 (Traffic and Transportation).

E.35-1 Thank you for your comment.

E.35-2 Thank you for your comment.

E.35-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns. The commenter references "California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 14010(c)" which, for clarification, is intended to serve as guidance for the California Department of Education (CDE) in the identification of new school sites; these regulations are not applicable to SCE in the siting of transmission line projects. Section 14010(c) requires that school districts site occupied school structures a minimum distance away from the edge of a power line easement (or right-of-way), as follows: (1) 100 feet away from 50- to 133-kV lines; (2) 150 feet away from a 220- to 230-kV lines; and (3) 350 feet away from 500- to 550-kV lines. Please note that the proposed Project would not result in placement of a transmission line within 350 feet of any occupied school structures in the Chino Hills area.

- E.35-4 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Responses GR-8 and GR-10, respectively, regarding the use of a 150-foot-wide ROW in Segment 8A and tower failure.
- E.36-1 Please see General Response GR-9 (Contribution of Funds as Mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act). Mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce the significance of Project impacts are presented and discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding the Project; all comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers, and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.
- E.36-2 Thank you for expressing your opinions and recommendation. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the document.
- E.37-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding the potential tower failure.
- E.37-2 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-10 regarding the potential tower failure.
- E.37-3 Thank you for your comment.
- E.38-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.38-2 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project. Potential disturbance associated with the construction of the proposed Project is discussed throughout the Draft EIR/EIS and the adverse visual impacts of the Project are discussed in detail in Section 3.14 of the Draft EIR/EIS.
- E.38-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.38-4 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-8 for use of 150-foot-wide Right of Way (ROW) in Segment 8A. Also, please see GR-10 regarding tower failure.
- E.38-5 Thank you for expressing your concerns. Please see General Response GR-10.
- E.38-6 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.38-7 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Responses GR-2 and GR-3 regarding electric and magnetic fields, and electrical interference.
- E.38-8 For clarification, the setback limit for schools that is noted by the commenter is a guideline that is set and used by the California Department of Education (CDE) in the School Site Selection and Approval Guide for use in identifying new school sites; these setback guidelines are not applicable to SCE in the siting of transmission line projects. The federal decision-makers are not aware of any applicable regulations of the CDE that would be violated by the proposed Project. However, the Draft EIR/EIS includes analysis of environmental issue areas that are also considered by the CDE in siting new school locations. With regards to proximity to high-voltage transmission lines, Sections 3.17 (Electrical Interference and Hazards) and

5.3.1 (Other Considerations) of the Draft EIR/EIS acknowledge that persons in close proximity to transmission lines would be exposed to EMF.

Please see General Response GR-5 (Effects on Property Values) for a discussion of how effects to property values are assessed and how the value of properties in the Project area may be affected by new transmission line construction. Thank you for submitting your comments and concerns regarding the Project; all comments will be shared with federal decision-makers, and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.

E.39-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.

E.40-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-8 regarding the use of a 150-foot-wide ROW in Segment 8A.

E.40-2 Thank you for your comment.

Under SCE's Easement Policy (Rev. 1, July 7, 2008), it is stated that "Buildings and other permanent structures, both above ground and underground are prohibited within SCE's ROWs. Examples of permanent structures are pipelines, concrete slabs [i.e., parking lot], foundations, vaults, decks, detention basins, pools, and anything else that is not portable and easily moveable." In SCE's Secondary Land Use Policy, it states that SCE "will permit secondary uses of its transmission rights-of-way only when these secondary land uses do not conflict with current or projected first priority use, as determined by the company's Transmission and Distribution Business Unit (TDBU). Such uses will be low intensity in nature....Other possible low-intensity projects include short-term or overflow parking lots or equestrian stables. Since these are not the preferred uses, SCE will not actively pursue these uses but will consider them on a case-by-case basis." Previously existing land uses, such as parking lots, that may conflict with SCE's Secondary Land Use Policy and Transmission Line Right of Way Requirements will be reviewed by SCE on a case-by-case basis. It should be noted that SCE is currently working towards a system-wide policy regarding land uses under 500-kV T/LS; however, this policy is not yet in place.

E.40-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.

E.41-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinion regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.

E.41-2 Please see General Response GR-9 (Contribution of Funds as Mitigation under the California Environmental Quality Act). Mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce the significance of Project impacts are presented and discussed throughout Chapter 3 of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impacts of the Project related to wildlife movement are discussed in Section 3.4 (Biological Resources) of the Draft EIR/EIS. Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding the Project; all comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers, and may be considered in making a decision on the Project.

E.41-3 Thank you for your comment. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the document.

- E.41-4 Thank you for your comment.
- E.41-5 Thank you for expressing your opinion regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.42-1 Thank you for your comment. Your support of Alternative Route C is noted. Please note that the Draft EIR/EIS does not make a recommendation for approval of the proposed Project or any alternative.
- E.43-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.44-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project. Please see General Response GR-2 regarding Electric and Magnetic Fields.
- E.45-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project. Please see General Response GR-8 regarding the use of a 150-foot-wide ROW in Segment 8A and General Response GR-2 regarding Electric and Magnetic Fields.
- E.46-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project.
- E.46-2 Thank you for your comment. Please see General Response GR-8 and GR-2, respectively, regarding use of a 150-foot-wide ROW and Electric and Magnetic Fields.
- E.46-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project.
- E.47-1 Thank you for expressing your opinion. Please see the response to Comment A.23-15 and General Response GR-9 regarding Chino Hills' proposed Mitigation and Cost Recovery Plan.
- E.47-2 Thank you for submitting your concerns regarding the assessment of hydrologic and biological impacts under Alternative 2 (proposed Project) and Alternative 4 (Chino Hills Route Alternatives). Impacts to streams and other hydrologic systems are addressed for the proposed Project and all alternatives, including the Alternative 4 routing options, in Section 3.8 (Hydrology and Water Quality) of the Draft EIR/EIS. Impacts related to habitat for wildlife and vegetation through would result under the proposed Project and each of the Project alternatives are addressed in Section 3.4 (Biological Resources). In addition, a comparison between the proposed Project and all alternatives is provided in Chapter 4 (Comparison of Alternatives) of the Draft EIR/EIS, including discussion of how impacts would vary across all environmental issue areas for each identified alternative.
- E.47-3 Thank you for expressing your opinions and concerns. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers reviewing the document.
- E.48-1 Thank you for expressing your concerns regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project.
- E.48-2 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the Project. Please also see General Response GR-10 regarding tower failure.

- E.48-3 Thank you for expressing your concerns and opinions. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project.
- E.49-1 Thank you for your comment. Your concerns will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project. Please see General Response GR-8 concerning the use of a 150-foot wide ROW for a 500-kV transmission line.
- E.49-2 Thank you for expressing your opinion regarding the proposed Project. Your comments will be shared with the federal decision-makers who will be reviewing the Project.
- E.49-3 Thank you for your comment. Your concerns will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project.
- E.49-4 Thank you for your comment. Your concerns will be shared with the federal decision-makers at the CPUC and the Forest Service.
- E.50-1 Thank you for your comment. Please see Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR/EIS for a detailed discussion and comparison of alternatives. Also, please see the response to Comment B.16-6 regarding the referenced mitigation package.
- E.51-1 Comment noted. Please see response to comment A.16-16.
- E.51-2 Please see Draft EIR/EIS Section 1.2 for a discussion of the Project objectives and purpose and need. Please also see Section 6.2.2.2 regarding current and future wind projects in the CAISO-controlled grid generation queue, specifically Table 6.2-2.
- Please note that while one of the objectives of the Project is to reliably interconnect new wind generation resources in the TWRA, under Sections 210 and 212 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. Sections 824 (i) and (k)) and Sections 24 and 25 of the CAISO's Tariff, SCE is obligated to interconnect and integrate power generation facilities into its electric system, which could include sources other than wind power.
- The No Project/Action Alternatives is fully analyzed in the Draft EIR/EIS. Future generation within the Los Angeles Basin is not impossible, as suggested, but would not meet the stated objectives, purpose and need of the Project.
- Thank you for your comments regarding the reconductoring alternative. Please see the response to Comment A.16-13 regarding the limitations of a reconductoring alternative.
- Please see the response to Comment A.16-24 regarding Project impacts on aerial firefighting effectiveness.
- Please see the responses to Comments A.16-1 through A.16-8 regarding the Project objectives, purpose and need.
- Thank you for your comments. They will be shared with the federal decision-makers who are reviewing the proposed Project.
- E.52-1 Thank you for your comments. The impacts to the Puente Hills preserve are addressed in Section 3.15. Also see GR-1 for a discussion of Alternatives Identification, Screening, and Analysis.
- E.52-2 See the response to Comment E.52-1 above.

E.52-3 As the commenter points out, the Draft EIR/EIS identifies adverse impacts related to noise, recreation, and visual resources, and these effects would be experienced on Habitat Preservation Authority lands as well as at other locations along the transmission segments.

As explained in Section 3.14.2.1, “From all possible KOPs, the most critical were selected as KOPs for analysis, based on their ability to exemplify visual resource impacts at a particular location. KOPs that were analyzed are representative of visual resource impacts to a particular landscape unit.” Appropriate locations and an adequate number of KOPs were analyzed to allow for the characterization of impacts, the determination of impact significance, and the need for mitigation. At this time, the federal decision-makers do not believe analysis of any additional KOPs is necessary and that an adequate number of KOPs have been analyzed to satisfy the requirements of both CEQA and NEPA. It is not required or necessary to analyze KOPs for individual properties or for each jurisdiction adjacent to or traversed by the proposed Project.

Mitigation has been recommended in the Draft EIR/EIS to reduce these impacts to the degree feasible. Please note that there is no requirement in CEQA or NEPA to mitigate a project’s impacts such that a net environmental benefit results.

E.52-4 Thank you for your comment.

E.53-1 Thank you for your comment.